DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 150 UD 013 186

AUTHOR	Feldman, Jack
TITLE	Race, Economic Class, and Job-Seeking Behavior: An Exploratory Study. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged, Technical Report Number 15.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISED-TR-15
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Employees; Expectation; Group Norms; *Job Application; *Job Satisfaction; Prediction; *Racial Differences; Research Methodology; *Social Differences; Socioeconomic Status; Unemployed; Urban Population; *Work Attitudes; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	Missouri

ABSTRACT

This study sought to test several hypotheses about race and social-class differences in beliefs, values, and social norms related to jobs and job-seeking behavior. A two to four hour interview was conducted by specially trained black and white male interviewers, who interviewed working-class and unemployed men of their own race. All subjects were paid volunteers, recruited from business or social service agencies in the St. Louis, Missouri metropolitan area. The multi-trait, multimethod validation strategy was employed to evaluate two methods of measuring: (1) the valence (evaluation) of job and job-seeking outcomes and behaviors (previously elicited from similar samples), and (2) the perceived probability of obtaining five direct outcomes of each of five job-seeking behaviors. It was expected that, because of discrimination and lack of work-relevant skills, the black samples (especially the black hardcore unemployed) would see work and the job-seeking environment as essentially unpredictable situations, where effort is not related to reward. This effect was predicted to hold for the white hardcore as well, but to a lesser degree. The white working class was expected to see work and job seeking as highly predictable environments, where effort is strongly related to reward. (Author/JM)

ED 072150

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

RACE, ECONOMIC CLASS, AND JOB-SEEKING BEHAVIOR: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Jack Feldman

University of Illinois

Technical Report No. 15

May, 1972

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5

from the Social and Rehabilitation Service

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Washington, D. C., 20201

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

UD 013186

Author's Preface

This study was intended to explore some differences among people of different racial and economic groups in the way they perceive the world of work and the way they go about seeking work. A large number of questions, both theoretical and substantive, were asked; a large number of answers were obtained. As is often the case, more questions were raised than were answered by the data.

Because the data are so extensive, a short abstract has been provided. It should be realized that the abstract, taken alone, is incomplete and probably misleading. It does serve, however, to introduce the reader to the problems and findings of this study. Readers with an interest in specific questions will find extensive and detailed data on each hypothesis in the results section, as well as some additional analyses which may shed more light on the problem of job-seeking behavior.

Much of the discussion section is speculative. The questions raised should be investigated in future studies. I hope that it will serve as a stimulus to others' thinking in this area.

RACE, ECONOMIC CLASS, AND JOB-SEEKING BEHAVIOR: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

Jack Feldman

University of Illinois

ABSTRACT

This study sought to test several hypotheses about race and social-class differences in beliefs, values, and social norms related to jobs and job-seeking behavior. Instrumentality-expectancy theory, as formulated by Vroom (1964), Graen (1969), Fishbein (1967) and others was the basic theoretical framework.

It was expected that, because of discrimination and lack of work-relevant skills, the black samples (especially the black hardcore unemployed) would see work and the job-seeking environment as essentially unpredictable situations, where effort is not related to reward. This effect was predicted to hold for the white hardcore as well, but to a lesser degree. The white working class was expected to see work and job seeking as highly predictable environments, where effort is strongly related to reward. Because of this, it was predicted that black and hardcore subjects would perceive lower instrumentalities between work and both standard and population-elicited job outcomes. It was also predicted that black and hardcore subjects would value material outcomes (good pay, etc.) more highly than whites and the working class, since they were relatively more deprived of these,

while the opposite relationship would hold for "higher-order" outcomes; that blacks and the hardcore would perceive more negative outcomes as consequences of job-seeking behavior than whites; that the hardcore of both races would report less insistence on steady employment by selves, friends, and family, but not society at large. Finally, it was also predicted that the evaluation of work, and job-seeking behavioral intentions, would be best predicted by the instrumentality model for white working class, and least well for the black hardcore unemployed, with the black working class and white hardcore intermediate.

Hypotheses concerning instrumentality theory itself were; (1) the basic term $\Sigma(AiIi)$ (sum of products of outcome evaluations and the instrumentality of working or not working for outcome attainment) would predict evaluations of work and unemployment in all samples, and have a significant weight in the prediction of behavioral intentions; (2) a normative term (sum of direction x pressure for four sources) would predict reported and intended job-seeking behavior in all samples; (3) a. the expectancy term $\sum_k(A_kE_k)$ (sum of evaluation of five direct outcomes of each of five job-seeking behaviors x perceived probability of their occurrence) would significantly predict evaluation of each behavior and predict reported and intended performance of each behavior b. A certainty-of-estimation term multiplied with the E_k, or probability term, would increase the validity of $\Sigma(A_kE_k)$; (4) The product of the perceived probability of finding work by method k x the direct evaluation of work would predict intention to perform and reported performance of that behavior; (5) the computation of $\Sigma(AiIi)$ using standard (non-salient) outcomes would lead to less predictability of direct evaluation of work than the same term computed using

population-elicited (salient) outcomes.

A two to four hour interview was conducted by specially trained black and white male interviewers, who interviewed working-class and unemployed men of their own race. All subjects were paid volunteers, recruited from business or social service agencies in the St. Louis, Missouri metropolitan area. Analysis of demographic and job-history data showed differences great enough to warrant the assumption of different social-class membership for employed and unemployed samples, and also revealed no confounding of race and social class. No unusual sampling effects were uncovered.

The multitrait, multimethod validation strategy was employed to evaluate two methods of measuring (1) the valence (evaluation) of job and job-seeking outcomes and behaviors (previously elicited from similar samples) and (2) the perceived probability of obtaining five direct outcomes of each of five job-seeking behaviors. Three-choice vs. nine or ten-alternative scales were the methods used. The analyses showed acceptable validities for nearly all items in at least one subsample. Due to range restriction in the shorter scales leading in some cases to zero variance, the scales allowing the largest range of response were used in all subsequent analyses.

Good rapport with interviewers existed; in addition, a "callback" procedure on a randomly-selected 10% of the sample insured their honesty. "Practice sheets" guaranteed that the subjects understood the rating tasks before actual data collection. Inspection of rating-scale means and standard deviations for all samples did not reveal consistent evidence of response biases in any group.

Contrary to predictions, black subjects saw stronger, rather

than weaker, instrumentality relationships between working and a variety of job outcomes (such as good pay, friends' respect, etc.) with the black working class seeing the strongest relationships.

In partial support of the second hypothesis it was found that black subjects evaluated several material and social job outcomes more highly than whites. Black working-class subjects rated a variety of outcomes, including some "higher-order" ones, more highly than any other group.

Directly contradicting the third prediction, black subjects saw fewer negative consequences of five job-seeking behaviors, and evaluated three of the five more highly than whites.

In partial support of the fourth hypothesis, unemployed subjects reported feeling less pressure from "themselves" to find a job if unemployed. This effect was replicated for perceived norm-direction.

The fifth hypothesis was not supported. The black working-class and white hardcore samples were the only groups for which significant multiple correlations between behavioral intentions and/or reported behavior and the instrumentality model were obtained (with one exception).

The instrumentality model was not well supported. Directly measured evaluation of work was not consistently predictable by $\Sigma(A_i I_i)$, and this term predicted behavioral intentions and reported behavior only for the black working class. A general normative term predicted behavioral intentions for two of five behaviors in the white working class, and for one behavior in the white hardcore sample; reported performance of a different behavior was also predicted for the latter group. Specific normative terms predicted reported and intended

performance of only a single behavior in the white hardcore sample. Graen's $\Sigma(AkEk)$ expectancy term was successful in predicting directly-measured evaluation of each of the five job-seeking behaviors in at least one sample; this term, however, does not predict either reported or intended behavior. The use of certainty weights decreased, rather than increased, the validity of $\Sigma(AkEk)$ in nearly every case. Perceived probability of finding a job predicted intended and reported performance of only a single behavior, in the white working-class sample, and that in the reverse direction -- the smaller the term, the more frequent the behavioral intention. Population-elicited outcomes did predict the criteria better than standard outcomes in six of eight cases. However, sample and measurement-scale effects also exist.

This general pattern of results suggests that the black subjects, particularly the working class, perceive work as a source of valued rewards, while the white working-class does not. This supports the idea of the white working class' "alienation" from work, as do negative correlations between evaluation of work and size of home towns, skill level of parents' jobs, skill level of subjects' jobs (hardcore), and level of education.

RACE, ECONOMIC CLASS, AND JOB-SEEKING BEHAVIOR: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY[1]

Jack Feldman

University of Illinois

Subjective culture has been defined as "...the way subjects in different cultures perceive and conceive significant aspects of their environment. A subject's 'subjective culture' is conceived to be his 'theory' of how his environment is structured. It includes his perception of others, his prejudices, attitudes, values and disvalues" (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967). In the past, attention was focused on the "subjective cultures" of other nations (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967; Triandis, Vassiliou, & Nassiakou, 1968; and others). More recently, however, interest has turned to the investigation of a subculture within the United States -- that of the ghetto black.

That such a subculture exists at all is open to question. Certainly the proliferation of "black literature," "soul"-based concepts in music, dance, and dress, and the arguments of black activists give evidence for it. On the other hand, one may argue that despite recent emphasis on "blackness," many of the "perceptions, attitudes, values and theories" held by the ghetto black are shared by disadvantaged

---

[1]The research reported here was supported by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5 (Harry C. Triandis, Principal Investigator). The assistance of Dr. William Harvey and the staff of NASCO West is gratefully acknowledged. The author would like to thank Harry C. Triandis, Roy Malpass, George Graen, Joseph McGrath, Martin Wagner, and Charles Hulin for their advice and comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

minorities of all colors and ethnic backgrounds. In short, it is conceivable that a "culture of poverty" exists, but not a specifically black culture. Roach and Gursslin (1967) argue against this notion, however, favoring both an examination of situational influences on behavior and the consideration of many possible ethnic-based subcultures. It is also possible that black American culture is just a slight variant of the dominant American culture, in the sense that it shares most perspectives of the larger culture of which it is a part.

This study focuses specifically on possible subcultural differences related to work and job-seeking behavior.

On one hand, Champagne and King (1967) report that Southern samples of black and white workers assign somewhat different scale values to 16 job-related "motivational" factors (good pay, working conditions, promotion, duty, etc.). Bloom and Barry (1967) report that a factor analysis of job-outcome ratings by black workers (when compared to previous white data) showed that blacks considered "hygiene" factors (Herzberg, et al., 1959) more important than "motivators" though their data do not support their conclusions. Maslow's (1954) theory would also predict this relationship, since blacks are relatively more deprived than whites of material goods, necessary for the satisfaction of "lower-order" needs.

On the other hand, Liebow's (1967) participant-observation study of 24 "streetcorner" black men led him to conclude that a separate subculture does not exist. Rather, he maintains, failure to achieve success in terms of the larger society leads to a shift in the reference group which reduces the impact of his failure, as dissonance theory would predict. Of course, once formed, such attitudes may be

passed on to others, and become general within a group. Thus, failure could cause the emergence of a deviant subculture. This point has also been made by Cohen (1955) in relation to juvenile delinquency.

Quite probably, reality lies somewhere between these positions. It is hard not to believe that all disadvantaged groups share similar perceptions, attitudes, and values with respect to some features of the larger society -- policemen, for example, or landlords, or some job situations. However, black people have a unique history, tradition and situation, and it is likely that this uniqueness is reflected in their "perceptions and conceptions" of the world. The very fact of blackness is enough, in itself, to engender unique perceptions of one's self and the world. The poorest Appalachian white is able, with proper changes in attire, to lose himself in a crowd; the black man stands out, except in company with other blacks. This easy identifiability and consequent openness to discrimination very probably affects the way in which black men (and women) view the world. [See Symonds (1969) and Triandis, Feldman and Harvey (1970; 1971a, b, c) for a descriptive review of the literature and four exploratory studies of black subjective culture.]

It should be noted at this time that race is not meant to be taken as a causal variable in any sense of the word. As Montagu (1960) has pointed out, "race" is an essentially meaningless term, used by the layman to distinguish <u>socially-defined</u> groups of people. As such, it becomes a "folk concept" (Malpass, personal communication) often used in an inappropriate sense, as in the attribution of stereotypes.

Race, as it is used in this paper, is a term of convenience, to designate identifiable subgroups of the population which may or may not constitute subcultures. Causality is thought of as residing in the

social environments of the subgroups sampled here. This environment includes responses to members of the various groups from the society as a whole (as in discrimination or preferential treatment), in the values, norms, expectations, etc., which are learned by group members, and the family, peer group, and neighborhood structures which are experienced.

There are socially, as well as theoretically, relevant reasons for the present investigation. Triandis and Malpass (1971) have stated that "unemployment and low income may be the most significant problems facing black Americans today." The author is in basic agreement with this statement, and believes that the study of the subjective culture of the low income black community may help to alleviate this problem in a number of ways; these include increasing the understanding of black personnel by white supervisors and managers, and possible organizational restructuring to take into account the culture of black workers.

The author also largely agrees with Porter and Lawler (1968) that work "...is a way of life that largely determines where (the workers) will live, with whom they associate, and even what their children will become." In other words, that part of subjective culture reflected in employment-related behavior is an important topic in both a scientific and social sense, and will be the subject of this study. More specifically, the present study investigates differences between blacks and whites of both hardcore and working-class economic categories in the areas of evaluation of work outcomes, perceived relations between working and the receipt of these outcomes, norms and values related to job-seeking behavior, and the predictability of behavioral intentions in the job-seeking area. The theoretical model used is instrumentality-expectancy theory, as formulated by Vroom (1964), Fishbein (1967),

Graen (1968a, b; 1969) and Porter and Lawler (1968).

The place of instrumentality theories in the study of subjective culture is apparent. As an off-shoot of philosophical hedonism, the theory in its general form states that behavior is a joint functic of the value of reinforcing outcomes (valence) and the subjective probability that a given behavior will lead to these outcomes. Although investigators have added various other considerations to the theory, this remains the underlying principle. Insofar as "subjective culture," by definition, includes the value of various reinforcing events to the individual, the perceived relationships between behavior and reward and other, normative, influences on behavior, such theories serve a definite heuristic function, providing hypotheses for test and a guide for the collection of data.

Symonds' (1969) literature review points to some aspects of the hypothetical black culture which are relevant to the prediction of job attitudes and behavior. He cites several studies showing that blacks have low self-evaluations and an unclear sense of identity, as well as low participation in racially integrated situations due to a fear of failure and consequent humiliation; adding to this the fact of real-life discrimination, he hypothesizes that apathy and a self-protective withdrawal from competitive situations is typical of the ghetto black. Coupled with apathy is a hypothesized rejection of middle-class values -- work as a goal in itself, the value of education, etc. When we add to this a difference in values as to the "disgrace" of extralegal occupations, living on welfare, illegitimacy, etc., the implications for employment-seeking behavior are immediately apparent. (For a graphic description of ghetto life and illustration of the above points,

see Brown, C., Manchild in the promised land.)

To be sure, the studies cited by Symonds are not without flaws, especially since several are based on demographic statistics with definite biases and on projective tests of various sorts. Also, much of the data is more than ten years old, and stands a good chance of being inapplicable to today's young black men and women, even if it were valid at the time of its collection.

Contradictory data also exist. Symonds reviews several studies showing that black students' educational and occupational aspirations, and possibly need achievement, are as high or higher than whites'. Dreger and Miller's (1968) review also cites studies which show that blacks and whites often have similar educational and occupational aspirations. These studies also show, however, that blacks expect and plan for less prestigious jobs than whites. Dreger and Miller report, in addition, that blacks score lower on projective measures of need achievement than whites of the same intelligence and social class. Thus, it may be that some social-desirability bias, fantasizing, or both, entered into black subjects' responses to questions about occupational aspirations.[2]

Another group of studies relevant to this problem has been concerned with the variables of alienation (Dean, 1961), "anomia" (Lefton, 1968) and internal vs. external control (Gore & Rotter, 1963; Rotter, 1966; Strickland, 1965). Alienation as defined by Dean (1961) includes three components: Powerlessness, Normless and Social Isolation. External

---

[2]Since the proposed study is concerned with males, I have ignored sex differences in aspirations within the black community. The statements above should be taken to refer to males, unless otherwise noted.

control (e.g., Gore & Rotter, 1963) seems to imply powerlessness -- that is, a feeling that one cannot control one's reinforcements. It has been found that externals are less likely to attempt to control their environments through social action (Gore & Rotter, 1963; Strickland, 1965), are more likely to depend on "luck" (as defined by style of play on the Rotter Level of Aspiration board) in experimental games (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965a), and do not persist in a losing game except where the task is presented as one directly relevant to their own valued abilities (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965b).

It has also been shown that external control scores and anomia scores are related to more generalized expectancies (Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965a; Lefton, 1968; Battle & Rotter, 1963) of being able to control reinforcement through one's own effort. When we add the general finding (Battle & Rotter, 1963; Bullough, 1967; Lefton, 1968; Bradford, 1967; Lefcourt & Ladwig, 1965a) that blacks, especially lower-class blacks, generally score in the "external" direction and/or higher on "anomia," and the findings of Triandis, Feldman and Harvey (1971c) that hardcore blacks typically see weaker antecedent-consequent relationships in many facets of life, the relevance of instrumentality theory to race-related questions becomes obvious.

Gurin, Gurin, Lao and Beattie (1969) have recently reported that Rotter's IE scale is composed of two factors. The first, called "personal control," contains items with first-person referents and apparently taps individual's feelings of control over his own future. The second, made up of items with a third-person referent, is termed "control ideology" and seemingly measures a person's belief in the relationships among ability, effort, and success in society. Gurin,

et al. also wrote an additional set of items of which several loaded on a "system blame" factor, the extent to which an individual attributes his situation to the society or to himself. Interestingly, high (external) scores on this dimension are associated with participation in civil rights activities. It was also found that black students score lower on personal control than whites, though the two groups were equal on control ideology.

Forward and Williams (1970) have found that high feelings of personal control and high external-blame scores in young black students are associated with approval of the 1967 Detroit riots. These militant students also score more highly on need achievement, and have more middle-class attitudes toward money and work than the non-militant. They interpret these findings as support for a "blocked opportunity" theory of militance; that is, blacks who believe they cannot succeed in the system, and who blame the system rather than themselves, tend to become militant.

Thus, the low internal control scores reported by the authors cited above might be due to feelings of powerlessness (or low personal control), or to a belief that the system is not responsive, except negatively, to black people. The Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965a) results may be interpreted in this framework. In any case, the hypothesis that blacks, particularly the hardcore (as well as hardcore whites), have low expectancies of success in the employment situation is a tenable one. Lawler's (1970) recent addition of internal-external control as a moderator variable in his model, and Graen's (1969) statement that people must regard the work environment as responsive to their efforts before the instrumentality model becomes applicable are

justified whether or not internal-external control is a general or situation-specific variable.

A case study by Wellman (1968), though uncontrolled and anecdotal, is directly relevant. He reports that black youths in an Oakland, California, job-training program did not respond seriously to training in test-taking and filling out job applications, but were quite concerned with and serious about actual job opportunities. The author evidently believes that these men saw society as responsible for the shortage of jobs at their level, and for their own lack of high-level skill, and that they rejected attempts to change their mode of dress and behavior. They did not, according to Wellman, behave in "appropriate" (as defined by the administrators) ways toward the program because they saw little chance of its helping them obtain jobs. This case, then, provides some anecdotal validation for instrumentality-theory predictions.

Zalinger (1969) provides a cogent discussion of the (hypothetical) motivational structure of the poor, especially in regard to job-training programs. He proposes that the objective situation of the urban poor produces attitudes, expectancies, and personality characteristics which mediate against their taking advantage of the few available opportunities. Thus, the fact that only low-level jobs are available, for the most part, leads to the failure of training and job-placement programs. As the author puts it "...It is my contention that the structural problem of severely-limited job opportunities in America today <u>is itself a crucial component of the motivation question</u>; that the lack of decent, well paying, and meaningful employment opportunities in our society at the present time, <u>and the perception of this by the</u>

poor, is a more adequate explanation of the self-defeating behavior of the poor than is any explanation based on the alleged disorganization of basic personality structure." (Italics in original.)

Some suggestive exploratory data relevant to this argument are provided by Sheppard and Belitsky (1966). In a study of job-seeking behavior in Erie, Pennsylvania (which unfortunately included only 48 black respondents), they found that only 40% of the blacks regarded large firms as "fair" in their hiring practices; even fewer (22%) saw small firms as fair. "No opinion" responses were given by 36% and 44% of the sample for each category, respectively. These perceptions appear to be valid, since 50% of the industrial firms and about 66% of the commercial firms surveyed about their hiring practices said that blacks were unqualified for various reasons. Five per cent in each category (not included above) said they would not hire any blacks at all. Some of this may be due to the relative lack of education of the black blue-collar workers (as reported by the authors) but some is almost certainly due to actual discrimination. For example, 22% of industrial firms and 38% of the commercial firms who said blacks were unqualified reported that "lack of personal qualities" was the basis for disqualification (Sheppard & Belitsky, 1966, p. 153).

While not precisely relevant to the problem of black subjective culture, a review of job-enlargement studies by Hulin and Blood (1968) may further illuminate the relationship between values and job behavior (in this case, job satisfaction). They propose that the blue-collar urban worker is often alienated from middle-class values such as the value of work in itself, responsibility, authority to make decisions, etc., and thus is less satisfied with high-level or enlarged jobs.

One study (Blood & Hulin, 1967) supports this proposition, and the authors show that much data collected previously is consistent with the model they present. Although the model was not supported by Blood (1968) the hypothesis that workers of different "cultures" value the same features of jobs differentially (and thus that culture may moderate the relationship between job features and workers' satisfaction) remains viable. The model also fits well into the orientation of this paper.

Instrumentality Theory

It would be valuable at this point to consider some alternative formulations of instrumentality theory. Developed by Tolman (1932, 1959) as a learning theory, this model is based on the philosophical tenets of hedonists such as Jeremy Bentham and the expected utility model proposed by Bernoulli (see Sommer, 1954). Lewin's (1938) theory also follows some of these precepts, as pointed out by Taber (1970). The expectancy-instrumentality form was later adopted as a model of attitude and cognition (Peak, 1955; Rosenberg, 1956; Fishbein, 1967, Ch. 44). This theoretical orientation has lately been applied to job satisfaction and performance (Vroom, 1964; Graen, 1968a, 1969; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Lawler, 1968, 1970), verbal learning (Dulany, 1961); and the prediction of overt behavior from attitudinal measures (Fishbein, 1967, Ch. 47).

The similarities among the various theories are obvious on consideration of the prediction formulas offered. Rosenberg predicts attitude toward a social policy from the sum of products of (1) the importance of various values to the subject and (2) the instrumentality (extent the value would be achieved or blocked by the policy in question.)

Fishbein (1967) represents this model as:

$$A_o = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (I_i V_i)$$

A_o = attitude to the object

I_i = instrumentality of object for value i

V_i = value importance of value i

Fishbein's model of attitude involves beliefs about the object (B_i = probability that some concept X_i is associated with object O) and evaluation of those concepts (a_i). The prediction equation is thus

$$A_o = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (B_i a_i).$$

Vroom's system concerns the valence of job outcomes (which can be read as the attitude toward the job, or any outcome associated with it). The prediction formula used is:

$$V_j = f_j \sum_{k=1}^{n} (V_k I_{jk}) \quad (j = 1 \ldots n)$$
$$f_j > 0;\ i\ I_{jj} = 0$$

where V_j = valence of outcome j.

f_j = some monotonic increasing function, usually presumed to be linear

I_{jk} = the cognitive instrumentality ($-1 \leq I_j K \leq 1$) of outcome j for the attainment of outcome k.

The similarity of the formula to Rosenberg's and Fishbein's is obvious.

Graen's (1968) "Role Incumbent Model" is similar to the above, utilizing outcomes such as pay, promotion, accomplishment, etc., to predict job satisfaction.

For the prediction of behavior, which in Vroom's and Graen's systems means the prediction of effort exerted on the job, several

models are also available. Fishbein's generalization of Dulany's theory uses the equation

$$B = BI = [A\ (act)]\ w_o + [(NB)\ (Mc)]w_1.$$

Where A (act) = $\Sigma(B_i a_i)$, B = overt behavior, BI = behavioral intention, NB = normative belief (what the individual thinks he should do) and Mc = motivation to comply. How highly correlated Behavior and Behavioral Intention are should be a function of other factors such as opportunity, ability or skill, or other, perhaps unpredictable, changes in the situations. W_o and W_1 are regression weights estimated from data, and should vary according to the specific behavior one is attempting to predict.

Dulany's original equation, used in predicting performance in verbal-learning and concept-attainment studies, is:

$$B = BI = [(RHd)\ (A)]w_o + [(BH)\ (Mc)]w_1$$

Where RHd = the subject's hypothesis as to the distribution of reinforcement, or the hypothesis that the occurrence of a response will lead to reinforcement; A = the affective value of the reinforcement; BH = behavioral hypothesis, the subject's belief about what he should do or is expected to do, and Mc = motivation to comply; w_o and w_1 are again regression weights.

Graen's "effective performers model" is similar to these; his equation is: Role Behavior = (Relative Expected Utility) w_o + (Resultant External Pressure) w_1 + (Resultant Internal Pressure) w_2.

This equation is different from the others in that the <u>difference</u> in utilities, as well as external and internal pressures to attempt to perform at a given level, are used in the equation. External pressure appears to be equivalent to Dulany's (Behavioral Hypothesis x Motivation to Comply)

term and to Fishbein's (Normative Beliefs x Motivation to Comply). Internal pressure and expected utility terms correspond to the first terms in Dulany's and Fishbein's equations; Graen prefers to separate the extrinsic and intrinsic motivational components.

Graen's expected utilities and internal pressure terms are calculated according to Vroom's model, expressed as:

$$Fi = f_i \sum_{l=1}^{n} [E_{ij} V_j] \quad (i = n + 1 \ldots m)$$

$Fi > 0$; $i \Omega k = \emptyset$; $\emptyset$ = null set

Where F_i = force to perform act i

E_{ij} = strength of expectancy (subjective probability) that act i will be followed by outcome j

V_j = valence of outcome j (computed as above).

This term is similar to Dulany's [(RHd) (A)], and Fishbein's $\Sigma(B_i a_i)$ if one makes the appropriate substitutions. Vroom's model implicity assumes, then, that [(BH) (Mc)] or [(NB) (Mc)] have weight equal to zero, or perhaps that there is no variance over subjects in these terms within the industrial situation. Whether or not this assumption is justified is an empirical question which must be settled for each situation in which the model is applied.

Graen (1969) has provided a further elaboration of his model, now termed "interdependent role systems theory." The new equation for predicting job performance is:

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^{I} [(A_i I_i) E'] w_o + \sum_{j=1}^{k} (R_j P_j) w_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{k} (A_k E_k) w_2$$

(i = 1, 2, ... I; j = 1, 2 ... J; k = 1, 2, ... k)

Where B = performance gain

A_i = valence of outcome i

I_i = instrumentality of the "effective performer role" for outcome i's attainment

E' = difference between the subjective probability that the act involving greater effort will lead to more effective performance and the subjective probability that "standard" effort will lead to more effective performance ($E_1 - E_2$)

R_j = belief as to what person j expects him to do or not to do

P_j = perceived pressure to comply with the expectations of person j

A_k = valence of the intrinsic consequence k of the act

E_k = expectancy that the act will lead to consequence k

w_o, w_1, w_2 = weights in a multiple regression equation (1969, p. 21, 22).

Porter and Lawler's (1968) expectancy theory differs from those discussed above in several respects, though it is similar in background and spirit. For one thing, it is not stated formally, in terms of equations, but rather diagramatically (1968, pp. 17, 165). In contrast to the theories already mentioned, "abilities and traits" are specifically included in their model as variables intervening between effort expended and actual job performance. Role perceptions, analogous to normative beliefs, are also included at this point in the model, though a "motivation to comply" term is absent. As in Graen's (1969) model, Porter and Lawler's revised model separates intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as components of satisfaction, and provides a feedback loop which influences the subject's perceptions. In their system, however, it is the expectancy term which is influenced, and

not the instrumentality of second-level outcomes, a concept which is not present in their system. They view job incumbency and effective performance as a continuous dimension, not separate "roles" as in Graen's theory. Their use of separate terms for "need fulfillment" and "satisfaction" of needs, fostered by the use of a "perceived equity of rewards" term, is another departure of this theory from those above.

The results obtained by Porter and Lawler in a field situation may contradict Graen's (1969) conclusion that certain "boundary conditions" are necessary for instrumentality-theory predictions to be upheld. These boundary conditions are, essentially, that the organization be one with a "reciprocating climate" -- where performance is regularly evaluated, good performance is rewarded, and the relevant contingencies are communicated to the worker in concrete terms (Graen, 1969, p. 20). Of course, it could be that the managers in their sample were sufficiently aware of the organization's requirements and the basis for rewards that the boundary conditions were met. On the other hand, it may be that the boundary conditions only apply to a situation such as Graen used, where subjects are faced with an unfamiliar task, in an unfamiliar setting, under conditions of short-term employment by an unknown firm. This is not meant to deny the validity of Graen's findings, especially since his methodology and analysis were in many ways superior to Porter and Lawler's. Their use of t-tests to investigate the various hypotheses of their model was inadequate in several respects. First of all, the use of an extreme-groups design, with two levels of each variable, forces linearity upon the data, and may be misleading. Second, it does not allow an accurate assessment of the joint effects of several variables upon the criteria, as analysis of variance or

regression analysis might have done. Thirdly, they present no numerical information as to the strength of various effects, and thus no accurate assessment of the predictive efficiency of their model. Though Lawler (1968) has provided a more sophisticated test of the model, more research is still desirable, especially in view of the fact that many of the Porter and Lawler results, though significant, are based on small mean differences and account for relatively little criterion variance.[3] Lawler's (1968) use of multiple correlation is also inadequate as a test of other instrumentality theories, since they specify the use of a single term where Lawler uses six in his prediction of performance ratings. Cross-validation of the multiple correlation co-efficients obtained would also have been desirable.

The models reviewed above, except Porter and Lawler's, do not deal directly with the prediction of performance, perhaps wisely. Performance is difficult to measure adequately in field situations, being often influenced by factors outside the individual's control, or by ability factors (which only Porter and Lawler explicitly take into account). Graen (1968b, 1969) removed ability variance in his data through the use of residual-gain scores, training, and pre-selection of subjects, thus dealing with performance changes caused only by motivational differences.

Graen's (1969) revised model likewise deals only with the gain in performance from time 1 to time 2, thereby removing the influence of

---

[3] For example, in the comparison BP^1 vs. BP, p. 72, fig. 4-1, the value of Omega-squared (Hays, 1963) for a t of 2.16 is approximately .019. The comparison SE^1 vs. SE has a t of 4.63 and an approximate Omega-squared of .08. Inspection of other graphs reveals a pattern of large N, small mean differences and small but significant t-values which leads to low values of Omega-squared.

ability differences and unchanging situational variables (such as assembly-line speed), and thus predicts only those performance changes resulting from increased effort. (The model also presupposes the experimental introduction of a reciprocating climate.) Dulany's (1961) theory was developed in the context of experimental tasks which virtually anyone could do, given the relevant information; Fishbein's (1967) generalization refers to everyday behavior. Thus, it seems appropriate to use behavioral variables, such as effort, rather than performance, as a criterion in the evaluation of the behavioral predictions of instrumentality theory, unless one can develop an experimental task in which effort is highly correlated with performance and on which performance can be reliably measured.

A problem in working with instrumentality models may be termed "infinite regress." That is, the determination of the valence of an outcome is based on other outcomes associated with it and their valences. Obviously one could proceed further and further down the list of outcomes in this manner. The practical solution appears to be simply cut off the regress at an appropriate level. In terms of job satisfaction, this would be at what Graen refers to as the "first-level" outcome, involving such factors as pay, achievement feedback, recognition, etc.; these enter into the determination of the valence of "second-level" outcomes, such as job incumbency or improved performance.

A variable used to advantage in some studies of instrumentality theory, yet ignored in others, is that of salience of outcomes. Salience is defined by Fishbein (1967) in terms of the strength of a mediating response to a stimulus. For example, the belief "dark skin" might be highly salient for the stimulus "Negro." Thus, a salient response is

one that is easily evoked by the stimulus object's presence. Rosenberg has shown that the prediction of attitude improves markedly when only the salient values of an individual are used in the prediction equations. Kaplan (1966) has likewise shown an improvement in predictive power when only the most salient beliefs are included in the Fishbein model. These results become understandable when it is realized that an individual can make use of only so much information; which aspects of the situation are attended to is presumably a function of previous learning history, group norms, and other such factors.

There is controversy regarding this conclusion, however. Hackman and Anderson (1968) found no significant differences between correlations obtained using arbitrarily-selected outcomes, outcomes elicited from the population of interest, and individually-elicited outcomes. The differences were, however, in the predicted direction, indicating that salience may possibly be manipulated to advantage.

Graen (1968b, 1969) reports a test of instrumentality theory in which the instrumentality of a job for the attainment of various outcomes was varied. He reports that, for the job incumbent model, intrinsic outcomes correlated more highly with overall satisfaction than did either extrinsic outcomes or all outcomes considered together. If one assumes that intrinsic outcomes are more salient for the population, the data fits the results reported by other investigators. The finding that "instrumentalities only" correlate more highly with satisfaction cannot be explained so easily, and leads one to infer a certain "substitutibility of outcomes"; that is, as long as a job leads to some good outcomes, the better.

It should be noted that Graen's manipulations of climate led to

changes in the perceived instrumentality of various outcomes. This manipulation should, logically, have made those outcomes more salient to the subjects, at least temporarily. If correlations had been computed using only those variables whose instrumentalities had changed, the salience hypothesis would predict that these would have been the highest correlations obtained. This prediction is given some support by the fact that intrinsic factors correlated most highly with gain in satisfaction for the achievement feedback group, who experienced a change in the instrumentalities of several intrinsic outcomes. The results for the "effective performers" model support this prediction to a limited extent as well, suggesting that the prediction of behavior and satisfaction might be improved by a consideration of salient outcomes.

An important question which arises in connection with the above hypothesis is concerned with the measurement of salience. If the definition of "evocability" is accepted, two methods are possible (Kaplan, 1966). The first is an essentially idiographic technique. Termed "Method 1" by Kaplan, it involves the elicitation of beliefs to vary over subjects. Salience is operationally defined by the position -- order of beliefs elicited. Thus, the first elicited belief is more salient than the second, etc.

The second method ("Method 2") involves the elicitation of beliefs from judges of the same population as the subjects whose attitudes are to be predicted. As used by Fishbein, the beliefs most frequently mentioned by the judges are used to form the final scale.

In comparing the predictive accuracy of these two methods, Kaplan attempted to measure salience of "Method 2" beliefs by using indices of

"importance" and "relatedness" as weighting factors. Later analysis, however, showed little correlation between these two measures and position order.

Kaplan found that, by using only the most salient beliefs (in the Method 1 sense) predictive validity could be increased. However, the highest validity obtained was only equal to that gotten by the use of the more traditional Method 2.

This study attempts to test two sets of hypotheses. The first set, drawn from studies of black culture and values, are:

A. Racial and Economic Class Differences

1. Blacks will generally perceive weaker relationships between working and positive and negative outcomes than will whites. This relationship will be moderated by economic class (hardcore vs. working-class).
2. Blacks will evaluate job outcomes differently than will whites; blacks will evaluate material (pay, etc.) outcomes more highly than whites, while whites will evaluate "higher-order" or "motivator" outcomes more highly than blacks. This relationship will also be moderated by economic class.
3. Blacks will generally perceive more negative outcomes as a direct consequence of job-seeking than will whites. This relationship will be moderated by economic class.
4. Both black and white hardcore[4] subjects will report different norms in the area of job seeking (in the direction of less

---

[4]It should be noted that "hardcore unemployed" is a term of convenience, defined by two criteria: (1) whether or not the subject was unemployed at the time of data collection; and (2) the differences in job history and demographic variables presented in Tables 1 and 2. As can be seen in Table 1, the "hardcore" group can justifiably be called "habitually unemployed" (variables 5 and 6).

insistence on steady employment by themselves, their friends, and their families) when compared to working-class blacks and whites.

5. a. Blacks' satisfaction with (evaluation of) work in general and behavioral intentions in the job-seeking area will be less predictable, by the instrumentality model, than will whites'.

   b. The hardcore unemployed of both races will be less predictable than the working class.

   c. The black hardcore sample will be the least predictable.

The second set of predictions are based on:

B. Theoretical Hypotheses Concerning Instrumentality Theory

1. The basic theoretical term [$\Sigma(A_i I_i)$ or $\Sigma(B_i a_i)$, alternatively] will significantly predict the evaluation of working and being unemployed in all samples (when appropriate instrumentality terms are used), and will have a significant beta weight in all samples for the prediction of reported job-seeking behavior and behavioral intentions.

2. A normative component ($\Sigma(R_j P_j)$) in the instrumentality equation [analagous to (NB) (MC)] will have a significant beta weight in all samples for the prediction of reported and intended job-seeking behavior.

3. a. Graen's expectancy term (for direct outcomes of job-seeking behaviors) [$\Sigma (A_k E_k)$] will significantly predict the evaluation of those behaviors and have a significant beta weight in the prediction of reported and intended job-seeking behaviors.

   b. Following Tolman (1959) and Graen (personal communication), it is predicted that a term measuring the degree of certainty

an individual has about his prediction of behavioral outcomes (expectancy) will, when used as a weighting factor, significantly improve prediction of the evaluation of the given behavior.

4. A term multiplying the perceived likelihood of a given behavior's leading to a job and the evaluation of work will have a significant regression weight in the prediction of reported and intended performance of that behavior.
5. If the general $[\Sigma (A_i I_i)]$ term is divided into two components: (1) arbitrary outcomes (the five factors of the Job Description Inventory) and (2) outcomes elicited from the populations of interest, the population-elicited (2) outcomes will correlate more highly with directly-measured evaluation than the arbitrary (1) outcomes.

Method

Subjects

The subject population consisted of black and white males living in the St. Louis, Missouri, metropolitan area, between the ages of 18 and 50. Because of resource limitations, a standard random sampling procedure could not be used. Instead, volunteer subjects were recruited from several industrial firms (in the case of the working-class samples) and from several social service agency centers (in the case of the hardcore samples). About fifty subjects in each of four categories were obtained: hardcore unemployed blacks and whites and working-class blacks and whites.

Interviewers

Interviewers were young (20-35) men, both black and white, recruited from the St. Louis area. All were high school graduates, some were

currently attending colleges in the area, some were working either part or full-time, and some had graduated from college and were working at full-time professional jobs. All were selected by the author or his associate (Director of Psychological Services at NASCO, Inc., a private drug rehabilitation agency in St. Louis). They were trained in the use of the interviewer's manual, the subject protocol, and the associated response cards by the author. (See Feldman, 1972, Appendices V, VI and VII.) Interviewers were paid $10 per completed interview.

Some interviewer attrition occurred over the course of the study. Two black interviewers left after an encounter with members of the local Black Nationalist Party, who objected to the study, seeing it as a form of exploitation. A third black interviewer was married during this time and left the study as well. Replacements were selected and trained by the local supervisor (a counselor at NASCO), who had been specially trained by the author in anticipation of such events.

Procedure

Subjects were recruited by their employers or by the agency, and were provided eight dollars each for their participation in an interview of two to four hour's duration. The interviewers (who were of the same race as the subjects) contacted each subject individually and arranged for an appointment, either at the subject's home or in a central location, at the subject's choosing. If the entire interview could not be completed in the time the subject had allotted, a second session was scheduled. Subjects were paid at the conclusion of the interview.

The form of the interview is presented in Feldman, 1972, along with copies of all materials used. A practice section was given for

each type of scale, and the interviewer could thus detect any misunderstanding before actual data collection. Also, the practice sheets assured at least a minimal familiarity with the scales for all subjects, and hopefully eliminated any "warm-up" effects from the data.

Subjects' names and social security numbers were taken, since they were required for payment, but subjects were assured that their data would be anonymous. Names were recorded on a separate sheet, which could be removed from the rest of the protocol, to further reassure the subjects.

Instruments

Work outcome-valence. Outcomes of working and being unemployed were obtained in three ways. First, five "standard" outcomes, paraphrased from the Job Description Inventory (Smith, 1969; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) and representing the five factors of pay, coworkers, supervision, promotion, and work itself were included. Next, outcomes were elicited from black and white populations, and the 10 most frequent added to the list (as recommended by Triandis & Malpass, 1970). Finally, space was left in the list for five outcomes elicited from the respondent himself, in response to the interviewer's request to "name five things you feel you get from working" (see Feldman, 1972, Appendices V, VI).

Thus, three distinct sets of outcomes are available to test the hypothesis that the most salient outcomes yield the greatest predictability, as in Kaplan (1966) and Hackman and Anderson (1968).

Job-seeking behaviors and intrinsic outcome valence. In addition to "working" and "being unemployed," the valence of the five most frequently-mentioned (by black and white samples) job-seeking behaviors

was also measured. In addition, five "intrinsic" or direct outcomes of each behavior were selected from the outcomes elicited from this sample and the valence of each outcome was also measured.

For example, direct outcomes of "going to an employment agency" included "filling out long applications," "being interviewed," and "waiting for service."

Ratings of the valence (or evaluation) of each behavior and outcome were made on two types of scales, to allow multitrait-multimethod evaluation of the concepts (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). The first method was a three-item scale. The second was Kunin's (1955) "Faces" scale in its nine-alternative version. Both scales were presented on "flashcards" to the subjects. Order of scale presentation was reversed from one subject to the next to avoid any overall order effects.

Instrumentality. The instrumentality of both "working" and "being unemployed" for the attainment of the twenty job-outcomes was measured using a three-point (+1, 0, -1) scale, presented to the subject on a flashcard. The order of presentation (employed vs. unemployed) was systematically reversed from one subject to the next. The use of the two instrumentality ratings allows multitrait, though not multimethod, validation of the measure.

Expectancy. This variable, the perceived association between a behavior and its direct outcomes, was measured in two ways. The first was a three-item scale; the second required each subject to estimate the odds, or chances, in ten of the outcomes given the behavior. A three-item "certainty" rating was made after each expectancy rating. The order of methods was reversed for each subject and each

behavior. The use of a certainty rating, which allows a weighted expectancy term, permits a test of Graen's (1969) "boundary conditions" hypothesis. The multiple methods strategy allows multitrait-multimethod validation of this theoretical construct, as well.

Norm-perception. According to Graen (1969) there are two components to a normative term: direction and pressure (from a variety of sources). The normative force to look for work (in general) as well as the force toward each specific job-seeking behavior, was measured on two three-choice scales for four sources: a subject's friends, his family, people in general, and himself. This method allows the determination of the power of each normative source (through its correlation with behavioral intentions) and the power of general vs. specific norms.

Behavioral intentions. This variable is somewhat unique, in that its meaning may change slightly depending upon whether the subject is employed or not. If employed, it is a measure of his intentions in the job-seeking area, should he become unemployed; if he is unemployed, it is a measure of the intended frequence with which he will use each of the job-seeking methods. A five-alternative frequency scale ranging from "never" to "every day" was presented on a flashcard to each subject.

Reported behavior. Past behavior was measured by asking the subject to report the number of times (when unemployed) he had performed each of the five behaviors. Because of reliability problems, however, this variable was rescored on a "yes-no" basis (yes = 1; no = 0). It is used as an additional criterion measure.

Employment history. Past employment behavior was measured by several questions, presented in Table 1. These variables are useful in a number of ways. First, questions on number of jobs held, weeks employed and

and unemployed, and reasons for leaving may serve to validate the sampling strategy. Second, by using these variables as predictors of behavioral intentions, reported behavior and valence of work, an assessment of the contribution of habit to current behavior may be made (see Triandis, 1970, p. 6). Questions about outside income may be used to predict job-seeking behavior.

Methodological Problems

Any study which relies for its data on the verbal responses of subjects in an interview situation opens itself to two different types of problems. The first of these is response bias, especially as reflected in response bias differences across samples, which may lead to spurious (from a theoretical viewpoint) differences. There is no practical way to guard against such effects; rather, it is hoped that a combination of scale-point definitions and the stressing of accuracy by interviewers will overcome such tendencies. Also, the scales and hypotheses are formulated in such a manner that extremity bias or "yeasaying" and "naysaying" tendencies should, if extreme, emerge in overall group means and thus be discounted. Later studies on this and related topics, hopefully able to use behavioral criteria, will also lead to the discounting of any dubious "false-positive" results.

Like response bias, the problem of interviewer bias can never be completely solved. In this study interviewer-subject interaction is minimized by the survey format, which is really an orally-administered questionnaire. Open-ended responses were minimized to avoid the necessity for probing by the interviewer and possible covert suggestion. The interviewers were also trained to adopt a neutral tone and facial expression when engaged in questionning, and were instructed not to

discuss a subject's answers with him. Interviewers were not informed of the specific hypotheses of the study; information given to both subjects and interviewers was limited to that contained in their respective "Introductions." (See Feldman, 1972, Appendix V). These precautions hopefully minimized any interviewer-bias effects.

Also, the interviewers' motivation was not primarily financial. They indicated, in conversation with the author, that they believed the study to be a potentially valuable one, especially for hardcore populations. Thus, they were interested in providing unbiased data since this would help the study succeed, and probably expended some extra effort in this direction.

Results

Validation

Validation of Measures

Multitrait-multimethod correlation matrices were computed for all valence and expectancy measures, separately for each racial and social-class category. Since the purpose of these analyses was to decide which of the multiple measures to use in the following, substantive analyses, and because the volume of data is so large detailed results will not be presented here. (Appendices I-IV of Feldman, 1972, present the tables of multitrait, multimethod correlations for each group of subjects and variables, with some explanatory notes.) The three-choice evaluation scale proved unsatisfactory, as it did not permit a wide enough range of response. Also, some specific items which met validation criteria (having the highest correlation in their row and column) in some samples did not in others. It was finally decided to retain all items for the substantive analyses for two reasons: (1) unreliability

of measurement would lead to conservative errors; (2) using different numbers of items in different cells of the design for correlational analyses would render the results non-comparable.

In general, it was decided to use the method which allowed the largest variance in response for each type of variable where a choice existed. This was felt to give the most realistic measure of the variable without too great a cost in terms of random error. Valence analyses were carried out using the Faces scale: the subject's own probability estimate was used in analyses of expectancy, and in calculations involving that variable.

Validation of Sampling Strategy

Job History. To be sure that the social-class dimension was not confounded with the race dimension, a two-way multivariate analysis of variance was performed on several demographic and job-history variables. Table 1 presents the results of the analysis of job-history variables. The multivariate race main effect was nonsignificant ($F = 1.245$, $p < .28$), and no significant univariate main effects appeared. The economic class main effect was highly significant ($F = 26.51$, $p < .00005$); within this effect, variables 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 showed significant univariate F-ratios ($p < .003$ or better in all cases). The multivariate interaction effect was not significant ($F = 1.58$, $p < .143$) but variables 4 and 7 showed significant univariate F's ($p < .04$ in both cases). These may well be chance, however.

Due to the absence of race main effects and the weakness of the interaction effects, it was concluded that no confounding of race and social class existed as a result of the sampling strategy employed.

Table 1[1]

Means[2] of Job-History Variables

Economic Class		Race: Black	Race: White
Hardcore	1[b]	12.79	31.27
	2	12.92	19.23
	3	1.08	1.19
	4[b,c]	21.94	20.62
	5[b]	22.60	19.77
	6[b]	.58	.56
	7[b,c]	25.48	40.65
Working-Class	1	1.15	1.46
	2	14.38	12.38
	3	1.17	1.21
	4	38.33	47.10
	5	8.10	1.90
	6	.12	.05
	7	18.73	5.04

Variables:

1. Money/month on public aid (dollars)
2. Amount of other money/month
3. Number of jobs in last year
4. Average weeks employed in last year
5. Average weeks unemployed in last year
6. Average quit/layoff (quit=0; layoff=1)
7. Average money/month during layoffs

---

[1] In this table, as in all others to follow, univariate significance levels will be given only if a significant multivariate effect is also present. This will hopefully avoid the acceptance of chance differences.

[2] Rounded to two decimal places

[b] Univariate economic class main effect significant at $p < .003$ or better

[c] Univariate interaction effect significant at $p < .04$

Table 2

Cell Means of Demographic Variables

	Variable	Hardcore		Working Class	
		Black	White	Black	White
1.	Age	32.23	29.27	32.58	30.75
2.	Grade in school (1=grammar school; 8=graduate school)[a,b,c]	3.40	3.29	3.37	4.85
3.	Job training[b] (yes=1; no=0)	.60	.44	.33	.31
4.	If yes to 3, did it help find a job? (yes=1; no=0)	.27	.13	.19	.21
5.	Marital status (1=single; 4=divorced)	2.00	1.75	1.98	1.94
6.	Years married[a]	6.69	3.62	8.10	5.29
7.	Number of children[a]	2.13	1.15	3.06	1.38
8.	Support others? (yes=1; no=0)	.15	.15	.17	.15
9.	Number of others	.46	.38	.46	.35
10.	Lived all life in city?[a] (yes=1; no=0)	.44	.63	.46	.69
11.	If no, how long?[a] (1=farm; 9=city)	11.42	4.77	6.46	4.81
12.	Home town size (1=farm; 9=city)	6.90	7.00	6.85	7.94
13.	Number of siblings[a]	6.00	3.79	4.88	3.13
14.	Parents together? (yes=1; no=0)	.67	.69	.67	.88
15.	If not, raised by: (3=mother; 1=others)	-.81	-.90	.79	.33
16.	Did head of house work? (yes=1; no=0)	.90	.90	.87	.98
17.	Level of work (4=manager; 1=unskilled)[a,b]	.69	2.27	1.90	2.71
18.	If no steady work, did head work part-time? (yes=1; no=0)	.46	.10	.63	.08

Table 2 (continued)

Variable	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
19. Were you on welfare? (yes=1; no=0)	.23	.19	.17	.06
20. Self-rated income (1=poor; 2=well off)[a]	2.10	2.79	2.38	2.85
21. Work part-time as child?[a,b] (yes=1; no=0)	.88	.90	.67	.88

Note: All means rounded to second decimal.

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .02$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .005$).

Demographic Data. Table 2 presents the results of a two-way multivariate analysis of variance on 21 demographic variables. Two significant multivariate main effects and a significant interaction emerged from this analysis. The table shows that black subjects tend to have been married longer than white, have more children, have lived in St. Louis longer, have more siblings, have parents that both worked less often and did less skilled work, rate themselves as poorer as children and have less frequently had part-time jobs as children.

Hardcore, as opposed to working-class subjects, also had relatively unskilled parents, but more often had part-time jobs as children. Finally, the white working class report higher educational achievement than any other group.

These data, with the exception of the length of marriage and time lived in St. Louis, seem to describe differences usually found when sampling social groups. It can be concluded that there is no basis for believing that unusual sampling effects exist which may confound the data. Rather, they reflect real differences in the social and physical environments of black and white populations.

Data on the relationship between job history, demographic variables and variables of theoretical interest will be presented later. It should be noted here that analysis of covariance using such variables is inappropriate, since they are systematically related to the "treatment" (sampled) conditions (Harris, Bisbee, & Evans, 1971).

Interrater Reliability. The skill level of each respondent's occupation and his parents' occupation was rated on a four-point scale (1 = unskilled, 4 = manager or professional). To assess the reliability of this scale, the author and two colleagues rated a sample of 25

Table 3

Intercorrelations[a,b] of Job Skill Ratings by Three Raters

		1	2
	1		
Rater	2	.87	
	3	.88	.89

[a]All figures rounded to two decimal places

[b]$N_{(items)} = 25$

occupations taken randomly from the data. As Table 3 shows, the reliability of these ratings is satisfactory. For data analysis, the author's ratings were used, except where questions arose. In such cases, ratings were decided by consensus of the three raters.

Tests of Hypotheses

Racial and Economic Group Differences

Hypothesis 1: Blacks will generally perceive weaker relationships between working and positive and negative outcomes than will whites. This relationship will be moderated by economic class.

This hypothesis was not supported. Black subjects' instrumentality ratings are more, rather than less, extreme than whites for 14 of 15 job outcomes (listed in Table 4), significantly ($p < .03$ or better) so in 12 of 15 cases. This is reflected in a highly significant multivariate race main effect ($F = 6.98$, $p < .00005$). A less significant multivariate economic class main effect ($F = 1.78$, $p < .04$) was also present, involving only three dependent variables ($p < .02$ or better) as indicated in Table 4. As predicted, however, a Race x Class interaction effect emerged (multivariate $F = 2.11$, $p < .02$). Variables showing significant univariate F-ratios ($p < .05$ or better) within this interaction are also indicated in Table 4.

Inspection of Table 4 reveals that the source of the interaction effects is the occurence of a larger difference between working-class blacks and whites than between hardcore blacks and whites.

These results cannot be explained by the assumption of an extreme response style in the black population, unless one is also willing to assume that the bias is even more pronounced in the black working class.

Table 4

Mean Ratings of the Instrumentality of Work for Fifteen Outcomes

		Hardcore		Working Class	
	Outcome	Black	White	Black	White
1.	Good pay[a]	.77	.69	.88	.58
2.	Work with people you like[a,b,c]	.60	.56	.98	.50
3.	Having a good boss[a,b,c]	.58	.50	1.00	.38
4.	Being promoted[a,b]	.60	.42	.92	.46
5.	Enjoying the work you do[a,c]	.63	.58	1.00	.42
6.	Having responsibilities	.73	.73	.67	.65
7.	Owing money[a]	-.44	-.13	-.62	-.02
8.	Saving money[a]	.85	.69	.88	.58
9.	Buying nice things (car, TV)[a]	.83	.67	.79	.60
10.	Being bored	-.60	-.44	-.46	-.29
11.	Having respect from family[a,c]	.88	.83	.98	.71
12.	Having respect from friends[a,c]	.81	.75	.96	.56
13.	Having fun[a]	.71	.67	.83	.54
14.	Being tired at end of day[a]	.06	.50	-.17	.56
15.	Supporting self and family	.96	.98	.96	.90

Notes: Ratings made on three-choice scale: +1, 0, -1, indicating positive, negative, or no association of work with a given outcome.

Outcomes 1-5 are paraphrased JDI factors; 11-15 are elicited from subjects similar to those sampled.

[a]Significant univariate race effect ($p < .03$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class effect ($p < .03$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .05$ or better)

Hypothesis 2: Blacks will evaluate job outcomes differently than will whites; blacks will evaluate material (pay, etc.) outcomes more highly than whites while whites will evaluate "higher-order" or "motivator" outcomes more highly than blacks. This relationship will also be moderated by economic class.

This hypothesis was partially supported. A significant ($F = 3.27$, $p < .0001$) multivariate race main effect was obtained, but inspection of Table 5 shows that the direction of effects was not exactly as predicted. Significant ($p < .03$ or better) univariate main effects were found for the outcomes "saving money," "buying things," "being bored," "family respect," "friend's respect" and "supporting yourself." In all cases, blacks rated the outcome more pleasant (or less unpleasant) than did the whites.

A significant multivariate economic class main effect was also found ($F = 2.11$, $p < .02$). Univariate F-tests showed that the outcomes of "having responsibilities," "owing money," "saving money," "being tired," and "supporting yourself" were rated significantly ($p < .05$ or better) more pleasant (or less unpleasant) by hardcore than working-class subjects.

A more highly significant interaction effect (multivariate $F = 2.95$, $p < .0004$) involved the variables "working with people you like," "having a good boss," "enjoying your work," "saving money," "friend's respect" and "supporting yourself" ($p < .005$ or better). On all variables except "having a good boss," black working-class subjects rated the outcomes as most pleasant, while white working-class subjects rated them least pleasant. For "boss," the black hardcore rated the outcome least pleasant. Thus, blacks did not clearly prefer purely material outcomes.

Table 5

Mean Pleasantness (Evaluation) Ratings of 15 Job Outcomes

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Getting good pay	1.46	1.40	1.13	1.44
2. Working with people you like[c]	1.54	1.27	1.21	1.79
3. Having a good boss[c]	1.85	1.46	1.31	1.73
4. Being promoted	1.52	1.35	1.19	1.50
5. Enjoying your work[c]	1.60	1.44	1.29	1.98
6. Having responsibilities[b]	1.94	2.33	2.50	2.96
7. Owing money[b]	6.19	7.29	7.38	7.42
8. Saving money[a,b,c]	1.48	1.87	1.33	2.73
9. Buying nice things[a]	1.38	2.15	1.65	2.15
10. Being bored[a]	6.88	7.12	6.60	7.60
11. Having family's respect[a]	1.40	1.88	1.23	2.23
12. Having friend's respect[a,c]	1.63	1.69	1.25	2.23
13. Having fun	1.81	1.77	1.58	1.98
14. Being tired[b]	5.06	4.79	6.00	5.58
15. Supporting yourself[a,b,c]	1.35	1.42	1.21	2.33

Notes: All figures rounded to two decimals; 1=most positive rating; 9=most negative

Outcomes 1-5 are paraphrased JDI factors; 6-15 are elicited from subjects similar to the sampled population.

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .04$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .005$ or better)

Hypothesis 3: Blacks will generally perceive more negative outcomes as direct consequences of job seeking than will whites. This relationship will be moderated by economic class.

This hypothesis was not supported. The data presented in Tables 6-11 directly contradict the prediction. For this hypothesis to be supported, the job-seeking outcomes rated negatively by blacks would have to also show a higher expectancy for blacks. Just the opposite occurred. First of all, as Table 6 illustrates, black subjects generally rated the 25 job-seeking outcomes as more pleasant than did whites (multivariate race effect: $F = 5.35$, $p < .00005$).

The significant economic-class main effect (multivariate $F = 2.25$, $p < .002$) shows that hardcore subjects were generally more positive towards the job-seeking outcomes than were the working-class, except for the outcome "going places with friends." However, much of this may be due to the relatively low ratings given all outcomes by the white working class, as reflected in the significant multivariate interaction effect ($F = 3.13$, $p < .0001$).

Expectancies (subjective probabilities) of obtaining the five intrinsic outcomes of each job-seeking behavior, plus the expectancy of obtaining a job by that means, are presented in Tables 7-11. For the outcome-expectancies in Table 7, blacks show a lower probability-rating than whites, as reflected in a significant race main effect ($F = 8.71$, $p < .0001$). The expectancy of finding a job through an agency, however, is significantly (univariate $F = 7.10$, $p < .009$) higher for blacks than whites. No other significant multivariate effects are present.

Table 8 contains no race or social-class main effects, but a significant multivariate interaction does exist ($F = 2.98$, $p < .009$).

Table 6

Mean Pleasantness (Evaluation) Ratings of 25 Job-Seeking Outcomes

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Filling out long applications[a,b]	4.94	5.48	5.79	7.19
2. Waiting for employment agency to call[a]	5.83	6.37	6.17	7.29
3. Being interviewed at an agency[a,b,c]	2.69	4.17	3.19	6.06
4. Waiting for service at an agency[a]	4.65	5.92	4.79	7.29
5. Paying a fee to an agency[a,b,c]	5.92	6.52	5.87	8.19
6. Spending money on bus fare to apply for jobs[b]	5.71	5.87	6.11	7.29
7. Waiting to apply[a,c]	4.60	5.02	4.52	6.38
8. Talking to company interviewer[a,b,c]	2.31	3.33	2.31	4.48
9. Filling out forms at different companies[a,b]	4.71	5.31	5.04	6.42
10. Getting up early to go job-hunting[a,b,c]	3.33	3.54	2.92	5.48
11. Being treated like a student[a,b,c]	4.10	4.40	4.13	6.52
12. Learning a trade or skill[a,b,c]	1.67	1.81	1.25	3.40
13. Getting paid for being trained[a,b,c]	1.44	1.65	1.29	2.54
14. Metting others in a training program[a,b,c]	1.69	1.81	1.63	2.79
15. Studying hard[a,b]	2.10	2.48	3.13	3.29
16. Wasting time[a,c]	7.33	7.44	8.12	6.96
17. Calling about jobs listed in want ads[a,c]	4.35	4.25	3.77	5.44
18. Travelling to apply for a job	4.02	5.38	3.81	5.52

Table 6 (continued)

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
19. Being turned down for a job	7.21	7.98	7.85	8.13
20. Reading a lot of ads before finding a job you are qualified for	5.06	5.81	5.72	5.92
21. Going places with friends[b]	3.60	2.96	3.25	2.71
22. Sleeping late[a,c]	6.15	6.27	6.19	3.75
23. Knowing your neighborhood[c]	3.06	2.58	2.90	3.90
24. Getting odd jobs[a,c]	2.96	2.83	2.21	3.96
25. Playing games (cards, etc.) with friends[a]	3.48	2.73	3.65	2.63

Notes: All figures rounded to two decimal places; 1=highest evaluation, 9=lowest.

1-5 outcomes of going to an employment agency; 6-10 outcomes of going from place to place filling out job applications; 11-15 outcomes of joining a training program; 16-20 outcomes of looking through want ads; 21-25 outcomes of hanging around with friends.

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction ($p < .03$ or better)

Table 7

Mean Expectancy of Obtaining Six Outcomes of Going to an Employment Agency

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Get a job[a]	5.75	4.92	5.62	4.69
2. Fill out long applications[a]	6.52	7.69	7.21	7.94
3. Waiting for agency to call	6.04	6.56	6.23	6.44
4. Being interviewed by agency[a]	7.04	7.48	6.37	7.79
5. Waiting for service at agency	6.46	6.79	7.46	6.92
6. Paying a fee to agency[a]	4.35	6.31	3.75	5.75

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .009$ or better)

Table 8

Mean Expectancy of Obtaining Six Outcomes of Going from Place-to-Place Filling Out Applications

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Get a job	5.94	5.40	5.79	5.77
2. Spend money on bus fare[c]	7.17	7.04	7.85	5.65
3. Wait to apply for a job	6.94	6.90	7.31	7.20
4. Talk to company interviewer	6.85	6.52	6.58	7.27
5. Fill out a lot of applications[c]	7.10	7.77	7.11	7.19
6. Get up early to go job hunting[c]	7.94	8.46	8.29	7.02

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .02$ or better)

Table 9

Mean Expectancy of Obtaining Six Outcomes of Trying to Join a Training Program

Outcomes	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Get a job[b]	7.42	7.35	6.44	5.89
2. Be treated like a student	6.33	7.11	6.81	6.63
3. Learning a trade or skill[a,b]	8.69	8.56	8.48	7.31
4. Get paid for being trained[a]	7.23	6.85	6.90	5.83
5. Meeting others in the program	8.31	8.98	8.60	8.69
6. Studying hard[b]	8.65	8.69	8.17	6.96

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .009$ or better)

Table 10

Mean Expectancy of Obtaining Six Outcomes of Reading Want Ads

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Get a job	5.10	4.85	5.58	5.29
2. Wasting time[a,c]	4.29	5.35	2.44	5.73
3. Calling about jobs listed	6.00	6.44	7.25	6.50
4. Travelling to apply for a job[a]	7.06	6.73	8.17	6.67
5. Being turned down after applying	6.00	6.33	5.94	5.65
6. Reading a lot of ads	7.00	7.54	6.88	6.65

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .02$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .005$ or better)

Table 11

Mean Expectancy of Obtaining Six Outcomes of Hanging Around with Friends

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Getting a job[a]	2.42	1.79	2.94	1.85
2. Going places with friends	5.13	5.42	5.34	5.63
3. Sleeping late[a,c]	3.88	4.13	2.96	6.06
4. Knowing your neighborhood[a,c]	6.10	6.02	6.79	4.52
5. Getting odd jobs[a,c]	6.31	6.69	7.69	5.71
6. Playing games (cards, etc.) with friends	5.69	5.85	5.83	6.67

Note: Expectancy measured by the subject's estimate of the "chances in 10" that the outcome would occur given the behavior. All figures rounded to second decimal.

[a]Significant univariate race main effect ($p < .04$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .007$ or better)

The black hardcore see a higher probability of spending money on bus fare, but a slightly lower probability of filling out many applications and getting up early. The first difference is even more extreme in the working-class samples, but the direction of the last difference is reversed.

Table 9 contains both race and economic class main effects, but no interaction (Race: multivariate $F = 3.83$, $p < .002$; Economic class: multivariate $F = 5.49$, $p < .0001$). Blacks estimate higher probabilities of positive outcomes than whites (learning a trade, being paid); hardcore subjects also estimate higher probabilities of positive outcomes (getting a job, learning a trade), but also estimate a higher probability of studying hard. This clearly does not support the hypothesis.

Table 10 contains significant multivariate race, economic class, and interaction effects (Race: $F = 6.52$, $p < .001$; Economic class: $F = 2.47$, $p < .026$; Interaction: $F = 2.48$, $p < .025$). However, no univariate economic-class effects (at $p < .05$) are present and this effect will be ignored. An inspection of this table shows the mean outcome expectancies for "reading want ads" are not consistently as predicted.

Table 11 also contains significant race and interaction effects (multivariate race effect: $F = 7.02$; $p < .0001$; interaction: $F = 4.29$, $p < .0005$). However, considering the direction of significant univariate differences in conjunction with the evaluative ratings of such outcomes in Table 6, the outcomes of "hanging around with friends" do not support the hypothesis.

Thus, it may be concluded that the sampled blacks perceive expected outcomes of job-seeking behavior as more positive than do whites. This implies that the black subjects should rate the five job-seeking

behaviors themselves as more evaluatively positive than do the whites. As Table 12 shows, this is the case for three of the five behaviors -- going to an employment agency ($F = 48.41$, $p < .0001$), trying to join a training program ($F = 81.24$, $p < .00005$), and reading want ads ($F = 13.90$, $p < .0003$). The overall multivariate race main effect was, of course, significant ($F = 24.74$, $p < .00005$). Significant multivariate economic class ($F = 5.07$, $p < .0003$) and interaction effects ($F = 4.06$, $p < .002$) were also present. These effects reflect the tendency of the hardcore subjects to evaluate those behaviors on which there was a difference more highly than the working class, and the tendency of the white working class to rate the evaluation of all behaviors lower than any other group.

The above implies, by Fishbein's (1967) theory, that if the "attitude toward the act" component has any appreciable weight in determining the behavioral intentions, blacks should have significantly stronger behavioral intentions toward each of the job-seeking methods discussed above. Table 13 reveals this to be the case for all behaviors except "reading want ads" and "hanging around with friends" (overall multivariate race main effect $F = 7.76$, $p < .0001$; univariate effects significant at $p < .05$ or better). Also, other factors seem to be influencing behavioral intentions, as will be discussed below.

Significant economic class (multivariate $F = 5.25$, $p < .0001$) and interaction effects (multivariate $F = 2.40$, $p < .03$) were also present, but no clear pattern exists.

Hypothesis 4: Both black and white hardcore subjects will report different norms in the area of job seeking (in the direction of less insistence on steady employment by themselves, their friends and their

Table 12

Mean Pleasantness (Evaluation) Ratings of Five Job-Seeking Behaviors

Behavior	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Going to an employment agency[a,b,c]	3.81	5.33	3.94	6.88
2. Going from place to place filling out applications[b]	5.06	5.10	5.44	6.67
3. Trying to join a training program[a,b,c]	1.73	2.94	1.65	4.71
4. Reading want ads in the newspaper[a,c]	4.21	4.58	3.37	5.29
5. Hanging around with friends	6.19	5.75	6.13	6.54

Note: All figures rounded to the second decimal; 1=highest evaluation, 9=lowest evaluation.

[a]Univariate race main effect (significant at $p < .003$ or better)

[b]Univariate economic class main effect (significant at $p < .009$ or better)

[c]Univariate interaction effect (significant at $p < .03$ or better)

Table 13

Intended Frequency of Performance of Six Job-Seeking Behaviors

Behavior	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Look for work[a]	3.69	3.42	3.58	3.25
2. Go to an employment agency[a]	2.77	1.93	2.94	2.03
3. Fill out many applications[a]	3.23	3.13	3.29	2.65
4. Read want ads[b]	3.23	3.13	3.48	3.50
5. Try to join a training program[a,b]	1.17	0.42	1.77	0.96
6. Hang around with friends[c]	1.60	2.02	1.90	1.29

Note: Five-point scale: 0=never, 4=every day; all numbers rounded to two decimal places.

[a]Significant univariate race effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class effect ($p < .05$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .02$)

families) when compared to working-class blacks and whites.

This hypothesis, strictly taken, refers to the "perceived pressure" ratings of the general norm -- "If unemployed, you should look for work until you find it." Table 14 shows that, for this variable, the hypothesis is partially supported. A marginally significant ($F = 2.53$, $p < .05$) multivariate economic class main effect is due primarily to the perceived pressure from one's self, rather than family, friends or society in general (univariate $F = 8.73$, $p < .004$). As expected, the working-class subjects report higher pressure to find a job than do the hardcore. Also as predicted, no significant multivariate race effect emerged ($F = 2.18$, $p < .08$). A significant interaction effect was present, however (multivariate $F = 3.79$, $p < .006$), due to the black working-class's perception of higher pressure from "people in general" ($F = 13.56$, $p < .0003$).

The analysis of perceived norm-direction shows similar results for one's own norm. As Table 15 illustrates, the hardcore do not make as many "should do" responses as do the working class. The source "people in general" also shows an economic-class effect, but in the opposite direction. Significant multivariate economic class ($F = 3.19$, $p < .02$) and interaction effects ($F = 6.10$, $p < .0002$) are both present; their component univariate effects are noted in Table 15. No significant multivariate race effect was obtained ($F = 1.65$, $p < .16$). It may be concluded that the hypothesis is partially supported by these data, since the predicted effect occurred for one of three dependent variables.

Hypothesis 5: a. Blacks' evaluation of work in general, and their behavioral intentions and reported behavior in the job-seeking area, will be less predictable by the instrumentality model than will whites'.

Table 14

Perceived Normative Pressure from Four Sources to Look for Work

Norm Source	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Friends	2.42	2.27	2.50	2.31
2. Family	2.92	2.90	2.98	2.94
3. People in general[c]	1.94	2.10	2.23	1.69
4. Self[b]	2.90	2.79	3.00	2.94

Note: Ratings range from 1 (low) to 3 (high); all figures rounded to the second decimal.

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .004$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .0003$ or better)

Table 15

Perceived Norm Direction from Four Sources to Look for Work

Norm Source	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Friends	2.65	2.77	2.79	2.73
2. Family	2.98	3.00	3.00	2.96
3. People in general[b,c]	2.40	2.71	2.54	2.17
4. Self[b]	2.98	2.87	3.00	2.98

Note: Should not=1, should=3; all figures rounded to second decimal.

[b]Significant univariate economic class main effect ($p < .04$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .0001$ or better)

b. The hardcore unemployed of both races will be less predictable than the working class, on the above variables.

c. The black hardcore will be the least predictable of the four samples.

This hypothesis is quite complex, and testing it adequately requires several kinds of data. Tables 16 and 17 present data relevant to the predictions of the valence of work. Two separate predictors are used: (1) the sum of the valence (measured by the Faces scale) of the JDI factors, rated as job outcomes, times the instrumentality of work for their attainment; (2) the sum of the valence of the population-elicited outcomes times the instrumentality of work for their attainment. The valence of work as directly measured on both the three-choice SD scale and the Faces scale is the criterion. Since these scales are scored in opposite directions, the signs of the correlations and regression weights in all following tables have been changed so that positive relationships indicate prediction in accord with the hypothesis.

A two-way analysis of variance (after Jones, 1968) was conducted on each set of correlations (actually, their z transforms) in Table 16, in order to test the valence-predictability hypothesis. A very marginal race main effect was found for JDI outcomes predicting SD ratings (chi-square = 3.083, $p < .10$), showing that whites' correlations are somewhat higher than blacks', but as Table 16 shows, these correlations are in the wrong direction.

A race main effect (chi-square = 6.477, $p < .025$) and an interaction effect (chi-square = 6.759, $p < .01$) were found for the prediction of Faces ratings. These are both due to the high correlation for the black working class. No significant effects were found for either set of

Table 16

Correlation of Predicted and Directly Measured

Valence of Work

Predictor:		JDI Outcomes		Population Elicited Outcomes	
Criterion Measure:		SD[1]	Faces[2]	SD	Faces
Sample	N				
Black Hardcore	48	+.12	.17	+.34*	.29*
Black Working Class	52	-.06	.53***	+.20	.19
White Hardcore	52	-.13	-.03	+.24	.33*
White Working Class	48	-.31*	-.25	+.45**	.20

[1]SD = 3 choice evaluative scale

[2]Faces = 9 choice Faces scale

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

Table 17

Multiple Correlation of Predicted Valence of Work Using JDI and Population-Elicited Outcomes with Directly Measured Valence of Work

	Direct Measurement Method					
	SD[a]			Faces[b]		
	Regression Weights[c]		and	Multiple Correlation		
Sample	JDI	+ Pop.	R	JDI	+ Pop.	R
Black Hardcore	.033	.336	.346*	.103	.274	.315
Black Working Class	-.105	.222	.226	.515****	.087	.540***
White Hardcore	-.259	.339*	.342*	-.181	.404***	.376**
White Working Class	-.222	.398***	.497***	-.217	.155	.293

[a]SD = Three-choice evaluation scale

[b]Faces = Nine-choice Faces scale

[c]Tests of regression weights are two-tailed t-tests with (N-1)df

*p < .05

**p < .025

***p < .01

****p < .002

correlations using the population-elicited outcomes.

Computing the multiple correlation of both the JDI and elicited outcome terms with the criteria provides another test of this part of the hypothesis. A marginal (chi-square = 3.041, $p < .10$) interaction was found for prediction of the Faces ratings, due to the high value of R for the black working class.

Inspection of Tables 16 and 17 reveals no support for the hypothesis as stated. Method variance appears to be producing some inflated correlations but neither consistently nor for every sample. From these data it is difficult to say which sample's responses are the most and which the least predictable, since such large differences exist between correlations obtained with different predictors and criteria.

Table 18 presents data relevant to the prediction of behavioral intentions (measured on a five-point frequence scale ranging from "never" = 0 to "every day" = 4) and reported behavior (scored on a "have done" = 1 to "have not done" = 0 basis). Multiple correlations in the table are based on six predictors: (1) estimated valence of work, based on JDI outcomes; (2) estimated valence of work, based on population-elicited outcomes; (3) the sum over four sources of norm direction x norm pressure for the general norm "look for work"; (4) the same sum of products computed for the norm for each specific behavior; (5) an expectancy term for each specific behavior computed by multiplying the (Faces) measured valence of each of five direct outcomes of the behavior by the subjects' subjective probability estimate (chances in 10) that the outcome would occur, given the behavior; (6) a "job expectancy" term, computed by multiplying the directly measured valence of work (Faces) by the subjective probability that the given behavior would lead to a job.

Table 18

Prediction of Job-Seeking Behavioral Intentions and Reported Behavior by the Instrumentality Model-Multiple Correlations Obtained in Four Samples

Behavior	Criterion	Sample			
		Black Hardcore	Black Working Class	White Hardcore	White Working Class
1. Going to an employment agency	BI[1]	.288	.384	.622***	.323
	RB[2]	.248	.411	.394	.361
2. Going to places filling out applications	BI	.368	.481	.581***	.402
	RB	.391	.317	.476	.374
3. Trying to join a training program	BI	.347	.594***	.322	.376
	RB	.463	.533**	.447	.374
4. Reading want ads	BI	.383	.613***	.665***	.459
	RB	.309	.492*	.404	.421
5. Hanging around with friends	BI	.372	.371	.499*	.448
	RB	.275	.367	.318	.505*

[1] BI = Behavioral Intentions

[2] RB = Reported Behavior

* $p < .05$
** $p < .025$
*** $p < .01$

Two-way (race x social class) analyses of variance were performed on the z-transformations of the multiple correlations for each behavior, in the same manner as previously. Only two significant effects were found: a marginal (chi-square = 2.95, $p < .10$) interaction on intention to go to an employment agency, and a somewhat stronger (chi-square = 4.437, $p < .05$) interaction on intention to read want ads. Neither of these effects is in the predicted direction. In fact, based on the number of significant R's, the black working class and the white hardcore are the most predictable samples, though significance is found for different behaviors. In general, it may be said that no support exists for hypothesis 5.

Theoretical Hypotheses Concerning Instrumentality Theory

Hypothesis 1: The basic theoretical term [$\Sigma (A_i I_i)$ or $\Sigma (B_i a_i)$] will significantly predict the evaluation of working and being unemployed in all samples (when appropriate instrumentality terms are used), and will have a significant regression weight in the prediction of reported job-seeking behavior and behavioral intentions.

This hypothesis was not supported. As Table 19 shows, significant correlations were obtained only in the white hardcore sample, and these may be due to chance. Significant regression weights were obtained only for the black working-class sample (see Table 20). While these results indicate the possibility of between groups differences, they do not support the original prediction.

Tables 16 and 17 do provide some support, however. In Table 16, at least one significant correlation is found in every sample. Likewise, at least one significant multiple correlation is also found for each sample in Table 17, but these do not represent a great increase in

Table 19

Correlation of Predicted and Directly Measured Valence of Not Working in Four Samples

Predictor:		JDI Outcomes		Population-Elicited Outcomes	
Criterion Measure:		SD[a]	Faces[b]	SD	Faces
Sample	N				
Black Hardcore	48	.10	-.01	-.12	-.00
Black Working Class	52	-.01	.09	.07	.08
White Hardcore	52	.33*	.30*	.12	.28*
White Working Class	48	-.16	-.16	.19	.21

[a]SD = Three-choice evaluative scale

[b]Faces = Nine-choice Faces scale

*$p < .05$

Table 20

Standardized Regression Weights for $\sum (A_i I_i)$ in the Prediction of Five Job-Seeking Behavioral Intentions and Reported Behaviors in Four Samples

	Behavioral Intentions		Reported Behavior	
	JDI	Pop.	JDI	Pop.
Agency				
Black Hardcore	-.250	-.025	-.050	-.095
Black Working Class	.125	.249	.089	.370**
White Hardcore	.041	.217	.279	-.218
White Working Class	.008	.007	-.229	-.035
Applications				
Black Hardcore	-.157	.103	.154	-.019
Black Working Class	-.154	.417***	.039	.301*
White Hardcore	-.008	.102	-.045	.081
White Working Class	-.179	.041	-.277	.145
Training				
Black Hardcore	-.123	-.060	.017	-.020
Black Working Class	-.030	.410***	-.007	.331*
White Hardcore	-.245	.005	-.236	-.120
White Working Class	-.005	-.117	-.118	.226
Want Ads				
Black Hardcore	.000	-.049	-.044	.182
Black Working Class	.337**	.248*	.153	.313*
White Hardcore	-.070	.195	-.063	-.070
White Working Class	-.226	-.091	-.115	-.027
Friends				
Black Hardcore	.051	.012	-.025	.110
Black Working Class	.077	.077	.156	.247
White Hardcore	.044	-.221	-.056	-.102
White Working Class	-.083	-.013	-.203	.030

*$p < .05$

**$p < .025$

***$p < .01$

variance accounted for over the single best zero-order correlation.

Hypothesis 2: A normative component in the instrumentality equation [analagous to (NB) (Mc)] will have a significant beta weight in all samples for the prediction of reported and intended job-seeking behavior.

It was decided that a general normative term (look for work) should be included in each regression equation, in order to assess the independent influence of generalized normative pressure on each specific behavior. It was found that the general norm predicts behavioral intentions better than the specific, if number of significant beta weights is used as the criterion.

However, as Table 21 illustrates, neither the general nor the specific normative term was very helpful in predicting intended and reported behavior. The white samples' beta weights were more often significant than the blacks', but no strong pattern emerges from the data. It must be concluded that this hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 3: a. Braen's expectancy term applied to direct outcomes of job-seeking behaviors (Σ ($A_k E_k$)) will significantly predict the evaluation of those behaviors and have a significant beta weight in the prediction of reported and intended job-seeking behavior.

b. Following Tolman (1959) and Graen (personal communication), it is predicted that a term measuring the degree of certainty an individual has about his prediction of behavioral outcomes (expectancy) will, when used as a weighting factor, significantly improve prediction of the evaluation of the given behavior.

Table 21

Standardized Regression Weights for a General and Specific Normative Terms in the Prediction of Intended and Reported Performance of Five Job-Seeking Behaviors in Four Samples

Samples and Behaviors to be Predicted	Criterion: Behavioral Intentions General	Behavioral Intentions Specific	Reported Behavior General	Reported Behavior Specific
Agency				
Black Hardcore	-.131	.040	.275	-.116
Black Working Class	.076	.299	.221	.004
White Hardcore	.217	.479****	-.036	.334*
White Working Class	.302	.052	-.079	.134
Applications				
Black Hardcore	-.040	-.088	.293	-.005
Black Working Class	.078	.191	.111	.034
White Hardcore	.167	.204	.437*	-.153
White Working Class	-.003	.322	-.040	.158
Training				
Black Hardcore	-.206	.165	.208	.110
Black Working Class	.439**	.017	.123	.221
White Hardcore	.089	.073	-.094	.314
White Working Class	.308*	.059	-.182	.122
Want Ads				
Black Hardcore	-.292	.271	.109	.015
Black Working Class	.248	.152	.137	.119
White Hardcore	.235	.187	.345	.043
White Working Class	.328**	-.028	.094	.185
Friends				
Black Hardcore	.006	.206	-.110	.072
Black Working Class	-.104	.062	.122	-.127
White Hardcore	-.320*	.093	-.202	.084
White Working Class	-.149	.081	.042	.175

*p < .05
**p < .025
***p < .01
****p < .002

This hypothesis is only partially supported. As Tables 22 and 23 show, the expectancy term does significantly predict the directly measured evaluation of four out of five behaviors in two samples, and of three out of five behaviors in the others. However, these same terms are never significant as predictors of reported and intended job-seeking behavior. Also, the addition of certainty weights to the sum of products reduces the correlation in almost every case. The notable exceptions to this are the black working-class' evaluation of "reading want ads" and "hanging around with friends."

In Table 22, the black and white hardcore's responses are the most predictable, providing a further disconfirmation of between-groups hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 4: A term multiplying the perceived likelihood of a given behavior's leading to a job and the (directly measured) evaluation of work will have a significant regression weight in the prediction of reported and intended performance of that behavior.

This hypothesis received little support. Only 3 of 40 regression weights are significant, a result which may quite easily be due to chance. The low regression weights are not, however, due to high intercorrelation of the variable with the two theoretical estimates of the valence of work (see Tables 19 and 20). The range of correlation of the three variables over all samples and behaviors is .55 to -.23, with a mean of .17. Thus, it must be concluded that the addition of the subjective probability of finding a job to the evaluation of work itself does not control any independent variance in the prediction of these behavioral reports.

Hypothesis 5: If the general $[\Sigma (A_i i_i)]$ term is divided into two components: (1) arbitrary outcomes (the five factors of the Job Description Inventory) and (2) outcomes elicited from the populations

Table 22

Correlation[a] of Predicted and Directly Measured Valence of Five Job-Seeking Behaviors in Four Samples

Without Certainty Weights

Direct Measure:	Behavior: Agency		Applications		Training		Ads		Friends	
	SD	Faces	SD	Faces	SD	Faces	SD	Faces	SD	Faces
BHC (N=48)	.422**	.674***	.355*	.348*	.115	.461**	.126	.406**	.001	-.078
BWC (N=52)	.279*	.423**	.449***	.308*	.124	.355**	-.195	-.210	.111	.176
WHC (N=52)	.364**	.653***	.309*	.696***	.436**	.569***	.194	.534***	-.060	.140
WWC (N=48)	.313*	.604***	.385**	.392**	.231	.187	.131	.215	.231	.306*

With Certainty Weights

BHC (N=48)	.417*	.678***	.321*	.262	.030	.440**	.104	.256	.062	-.034
BWC (N=52)	.296*	.316*	.359**	.346**	.088	.291*	-.362**	-.297*	.214	.277*
WHC (N=52)	.351**	.577***	.258	.652***	.241	.464***	.069	.299*	-.083	.093
WWC (N=48)	.293*	.576***	.356*	.382**	.183	.207	.263	.177	.175	.259

[a]All figures rounded to third decimal

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

Table 23

Standardized Regression Weights[a] for $\sum(A_k E_k)$ in the Prediction of Intended (BI) and Reported (RB) Performance of Five Job-Seeking Behaviors in Four Samples

	Behavior									
	Agency		Applications		Training		Want Ads		Friends	
Criterion	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB
BHC	.031	-.079	.311	.140	.120	-.003	.292	.187	.322	.228
BWC	-.086	.051	-.028	-.037	-.020	.095	.127	.230	.295	.110
WHC	.024	-.174	.011	-.095	-.019	-.030	-.033	.060	.010	-.048
WWC	-.162	-.035	.087	.089	.115	-.218	-.193	-.145	-.061	-.204

[a]All figures rounded to third decimal

of interest, the population-elicited (2) outcomes will correlate more highly with directly-measured evaluation than the arbitrary (1) outcomes.

This hypothesis was partially supported. In six of eight cases in Table 16 the correlation for the population-elicited items is greater than for the JDI. The beta weights for the population-elicited are higher in six of eight cases as well (Table 17). However, there are sample differences which confound this effect, as well as measurement scale effects. In general, however, the population-elicited outcomes do predict directly measured valence better.

Additional Results

This section will deal with findings which, though not relevant to specific hypotheses, are interesting in and of themselves. They are selected to hopefully shed some light on the perceptions of and motives involved in the job-seeking situation.

Perception of instrumentalities. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the rated instrumentality of not working for the attainment of 15 job outcomes, to explore the possibility that race and economic class may influence the perception of being unemployed. Two significant main effects and a significant interaction were present. (Race, $F = 25.49$, $p < .00001$; Economic class, $F = 2.97$, $p < .0003$; Interaction, $F = 2.89$, $p < .0005$). Table 25 presents the cell means for each variable, and the minimum significance levels for each univariate effect. It is apparent that black and white subjects perceive unemployment in completely different ways, at least as far as these outcomes are concerned. The economic-class effect is due to the greater polarization of the working-class ratings, while the interaction effect is due to a larger difference between black and white working class

Table 24

Standardized Regression Weights[a] for (Perceived Probability of Finding a Job x Evaluation of Work) in the Prediction of Reported and Intended Performance of Five Job-Seeking Behaviors in Four Samples

	Behavior									
	Agency		Applications		Training		Want Ads		Friends	
Criterion	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB	BI	RB
BHC	-.057	.007	-.139	.130	.250	.293	-.122	-.293	-.118	-.160
BWC	-.100	-.181	.066	-.139	.001	.075	.021	.006	-.294	-.309
WHC	-.135	.244	.293	.165	-.007	.061	.289*	.018	-.143	-.099
WWC	.079	-.187	-.072	-.156	.119	.147	-.148	-.296	-.351*	-.292*

[a]All figures rounded to three decimal places

*$p < .05$

Table 25

Mean Ratings of the Instrumentality of Not Working for Fifteen Outcomes

Outcome	Hardcore		Working Class	
	Black	White	Black	White
1. Good pay[a,b,c]	-.04	-1.00	.56	-.96
2. Work with people you like[a,b,c]	.31	-.96	.81	-.92
3. Having a good boss[a,b,c]	.15	-.98	.71	-.96
4. Being promoted[a,b,c]	.00	-1.00	.67	-.98
5. Enjoying the work you do[a,b,c]	.13	-.98	.77	-.85
6. Having responsibilities[a]	.52	-.13	.50	.00
7. Owing money[a]	-.38	.19	-.58	.38
8. Saving money[a,b,c]	.25	-.79	.71	-.85
9. Buying nice things (car, tv)[a,b]	.21	-.83	.62	-.69
10. Being bored[a]	-.25	.63	-.35	.44
11. Having respect from family[a,b,c]	.73	.21	.88	-.40
12. Having respect from friends[a,b,c]	.67	.33	.81	-.31
13. Having fun[a]	.50	-.13	.69	-.15
14. Being tired at end of day	-.15	-.19	-.38	-.23
15. Supporting self and family[a,c]	.25	-.48	.69	-.60

Table 25 (continued)

Notes: Ratings made on three-choice scale: +1, 0, -1, indicating positive, negative or no association of not working with a given outcome; all numbers rounded to second decimal places.

Outcomes 1-5 are paraphrased JDI factors; 11-15 are elicited from subjects similar to those sampled.

[a]Significant univariate race effect ($p < .0001$ or better)

[b]Significant univariate economic class effect ($p < .04$ or better)

[c]Significant univariate interaction effect ($p < .02$ or better)

subjects than between the black and white hardcore. These differences could not have been produced by an "extreme response" set, since the black and white samples are about equally polarized but on opposite ends of the scale.

Correlation of norm source with behavioral intention. In order to investigate the possibility that norm sources were differentially related to behavioral intentions in the four samples, correlations were computed between the product of perceived direction and perceived pressure and the behavioral intentions measure for each source, sample, and behavior. As Table 26 shows, differential correlations were found, but these are not as interpretable as expected. The few significant correlations in the black hardcore and white working-class samples may quite easily be due to chance. The self as a norm-source is more important for the white hardcore, but only for three of five behaviors. No other pattern emerges from the table.

Relationships between demographic and theoretical variables. In order to assess the possible relationships between the demographic data and the evaluations of work, unemployment and each of five job-seeking behaviors, as well as intention to perform each behavior and reported past performance, a 33 x 33 correlation matrix was computed over all Ss (N = 200). Since these data are too extensive to report economically, discussion will focus on the significant relationships between the demographic variables and those of substantive interest. An alpha level of .01 or better was chosen in order to prevent consideration of chance relationships and further limit the discussion to relationships controlling larger percentages of variance. Signs of the correlations have been reversed so that a positive correlation means that a high

Table 26

Correlation[1] of Specific Norm Strength (Direction x Pressure) from Four Sources with Intended Performance of Each of Five Behaviors in Four Samples

Behavior	Norm Source	Sample: Black Hardcore	Black Working Class	White Hardcore	White Working Class
Going to an employment agency	1 Friends	-.08	.19	.41**	.09
	2 Family	-.02	.13	.46***	-.07
	3 People in general	-.04	.14	.34*	.15
	4 Self	.07	.33*	.54***	.00
Going from place to place filling out applications	1	-.05	.29*	.42**	.16
	2	.01	.19	.17	.30*
	3	.04	.03	.05	.36*
	4	.06	.11	.66***	.20
Reading want ads	1	-.20	.36**	.19	.03
	2	.02	.34*[2]	.35**	.01
	3	-.02	.32*	.22	.22
	4	-.00	.34*	.59***	.10
Trying to join a training program	1	.26	.10	.16	.14
	2	.07	.01	.14	.15
	3	.09	.03	.17	-.02
	4	-.10	.11	.08	.06
Hanging around with friends	1	.18	-.05	.22	.03
	2	.30*	.08	-.25	-.12
	3	.03	.02	.02	.02
	4	.12	.16	.20	.31*

[1] All figures rounded to two decimal places

[2] $r_{2,4} = 1.00$

*p < .05
**p < .025
***p < .01

score on the demographic variable goes with a high evaluation score. Correlations between behavioral intentions, reported behavior, and demographic variables are unchanged.

The valence of work is correlated -.27 ($p < .001$) with grade in school, -.19 ($p < .01$) with number of children, -.24 ($p < .001$) with the size of the town the person was raised in, and -.33 ($p < .001$) with skill level of the parent or guardian's job. Valence of unemployment was correlated -.21 ($p < .01$) with age and -.19 ($p < .01$) with number of children. This seems to reflect dissatisfaction with, or alienation from, work on the part of the better educated, more skilled urban workers.

Valence of going to an employment agency was correlated -.21 ($p < .01$) with highest grade in school and .21 ($p < .01$) with number of siblings. Valence of trying to join a training program was correlated -.27 ($p < .001$) with highest grade in school and .21 ($p < .01$) with number of siblings. Valence of reading want ads was correlated -.20 ($p < .01$) with highest grade in school, .21 ($p < .01$) with number of siblings, and -.21 ($p < .01$) with working as a child (yes = 1, no = 0). These results also imply that the more educated, working-class persons (probably white) find the job-seeking process less attractive, and support the idea of working-class dissatisfaction with work.

The generalized intention to look for work was correlated -.32 ($p < .001$) with highest grade in school. Intention to go to an employment agency was correlated .20 ($p < .01$) with age, -.20 ($p < .01$) with grade in school, .26 ($p < .001$) with years married, and .33 ($p < .001$) with number of children. Intention to go from place to place filling out applications was correlated -.20 ($p < .01$) with grade in school.

Intention to hang around with friends was correlated -.23 ($p < .01$) with marital status. Reported past behavior (yes = 1, no = 0) of hanging around with friends was correlated -.20 ($p < .01$) with age, -.19 ($p < .01$) with grade in school, -.24 ($p < .001$) with marital status, and -.19 ($p < .01$) with years married. These results indicate that, as would be expected, those subjects with more responsibilities were more committed to work, in the sense that they looked for work more frequently than others and avoided nonproductive ("hanging around") behavior.

Relationships between job history and theoretical variables. The same logic as in the previous analysis was applied to the assessment of possible relationships between theoretical and job history variables. Since the questions asked of employed and unemployed Ss were necessarily different, the analysis was done twice; once for working class and once for the hardcore. Again, an alpha level of .01 is used; N = 100 in both analyses.

Working class. The general behavioral intention to look for work is correlated -.29 ($p < .01$) with number of jobs held in the past year. The intention to go to an employment agency is also correlated with number of jobs held (-.31, $p < .01$). Intention to hang around with friends is correlated -.26 ($p < .01$) with tenure on the job, -.29 ($p < .01$) with percent time (full = 2, part = 1) and -.30 with average number of weeks employed in the past year. Reported previous use of an employment agency is correlated -.33 ($p < .001$) with tenure on the job, and -.26 with average number of weeks employed. Reported "hanging around" behavior was correlated with pay/week (-.34, $p < .001$) and average weeks employed (-.36, $p < .001$).

These data indicate that subjects who hold steady, better-paying, full-time jobs do not use unproductive job-seeking methods ("hanging around"). It also seems to indicate that longer-term employees do not use the employment agency as a job source.

Hardcore. For this sample, the valence of work was correlated with skill level (-.31, $p < .01$) and whether or not non-public aid money is received (-.27, $p < .01$) (i.e., the higher the skill, the lower the evaluation of work; if money is obtained from nonreported sources, the evaluation is lower. The general intention to look for work was correlated -.27 ($p < .01$) with skill level and -.30 ($p < .01$) with whether or not unreported money is received. Intentions to go to an employment agency and to try to join a training program also were negatively related to unreported money ($r = -.27$, $p < .01$ in both cases). Intention to read want ads is correlated -.28 ($p < .01$) with pay on the last job and -.27 ($p < .01$) with skill level. These results suggest that the hardcore regard work primarily as a source of income, and that if another source is available, it is preferred.

Discussion

Racial and Economic Class Differences

The results of this study were by and large independent of predictions made on the basis of what seemed to be a reasonable theoretical structure. Speculation as to why this is so may lead to new insights and more accurate prediction in the future.

Blacks, in the first place, rated the instrumentality of work for the attainment of many outcomes higher than whites, or more often in the positive direction. However, they also rated the instrumentality

of not working for the attainment of the same outcomes in the positive direction. This may be due to any of several factors, both methodological and theoretical. Black Ss may not have taken the task seriously, or they may have tried to give misleading data. This possibility, while disturbing, is not likely, as the interviewers' informal reports indicated a high degree of interest and involvement on the part of the black subjects. Social desirability bias is unlikely, due to the nature of the blacks' responses to the "not working" part of the instrumentality questionnaire.

Means and standard deviations of all evaluation, instrumentality, and expectancy ratings were examined for evidence of response bias or "lack of cognitive differentiation" (H. C. Triandis, personal communication), reflected in systematically lower variances for one or more groups across all variables. No such evidence was found. Blacks were consistently high on some variables, and were low or less extreme on others, which is contrary to the definition of response bias. Also, systematic differences in standard deviations were absent. Thus, it may be concluded that response bias did not play a large part in producing the obtained group differences.

Substantively, it appears that the black subjects have stronger beliefs than the whites that work is associated with positive and dissociated with negative outcomes. This agrees in general with the results of Katzell, Ewen and Korman (1970) who found black workers to be significantly more satisfied with several aspects of their jobs; they also found black workers to have higher expectancies than whites that effective job performance would lead to advancement and good supervisor relations. The black subjects also believe, however, that

not working is associated with positive outcomes (though not as strongly as working) while whites believe just the opposite. This effect is especially strong for working-class subjects of both races. As would be expected, the black subjects evaluate work more highly than the whites ($F = 26.19$, $p < .0001$); however, they also evaluate not working lower than the whites ($F = 6.76$, $p < .01$). The white working class evaluates work lowest by more than a full scale point, while the black working class evaluates not working more negatively than any other group (though not significantly so). This inconsistency is reflected in Table 19, where the blacks' ratings of the valence of not working is shown to be completely unpredictable from the appropriate $\Sigma (A_i I_i)$ term.

This kind of inconsistency leads to the suspicion that the instrument itself is unreliable, and this may be true. However, black subjects also report higher perceived pressure to find a job when unemployed (though not significantly so), and this normative pressure, if accompanied by anxiety, may produce the low evaluation of not working.

Some of the data discussed above stand in contradiction to the conclusion of Triandis, Feldman and Harvey (1971c) that "...the black samples in general, and the hardcore in particular, see fewer connections between what one can do and desirable or undesirable outcomes..." Such a striking difference demands explanation, and one can be found in the nature of the samples employed. The Triandis, et al. black samples were "problem people" -- high school students with academic and social problems, and older men, many with a history of drug abuse and other problems in addition to unemployment. The white high school sample was similar to the black, but the middle-class whites were college girls, who might be expected to be extremely middle class in their

outlook. In contrast, the samples used in this study were all black and white working men; the "hardcore" had a history of job problems and were currently unemployed, but were probably not as stereotypically "hardcore" as the Triandis, et al. sample. Thus, the obtained differences are not as contradictory as they may seem, since the Triandis, et al. samples are more different from each other on several dimensions than are the present samples.

The (unemployment) instrumentality ratings by blacks can also be explained in a logical manner. If it is assumed that, in the past, blacks have been unemployed more often than whites, it makes sense to postulate the development of cognitive and real-world adjustments to the situation. That is, blacks may be better able to survive when unemployed because they have been forced to more often. Also, respect may be accorded in the black community on the basis of personal, rather than role, characteristics, since unemployment is always a possibility. In other words, you respect a man for what he is, rather than his job, since the job is controlled by factors outside of the person. Also, blacks may have developed cognitive adjustments which lead to the denial of bad consequences of unemployment. The author regards this sort of defensive adjustment and reality denial as unlikely, however, especially in light of the black subjects' low evaluation of unemployment.

Blacks evaluate many job outcomes as more pleasant (or less unpleasant) than whites, though the outcomes do not fit the Maslow hierarchy. The outcomes they value highly seem to be of two kinds: material goods (money, possessions) and respect from others. The hardcore evaluate responsibility and saving money more highly than the working class, and owing money and being tired less negatively. The

black working-class evaluates working with people you like, having a good boss, enjoying your work, saving money and friends' respect higher than any other group. The white working class tends to be low on all variables, indicating either a "negativity" response bias on their part or a real lack of high evaluation of many outcomes. If the responses are valid, they indicate that the white working class does not see as much satisfaction in work as do the other samples. One may speculate that this group is seeking to avoid the negative consequences of unemployment, rather than attain any positive goals, while the black working class is striving for the desirable goals they see as associated with a steady job. In short, the white working-class sample appears to be alienated from the work environment. This statement goes beyond Blood and Hulin (1967), who proposed that urban workers were alienated from the Protestant Ethic which supposedly characterizes the middle class. It may be that white, urban workers do not see work as much more than a means of survival. This statement does go far beyond the data, but may serve to integrate otherwise confusing results.

This proposition is supported by the correlation (over all subjects) of -.24 ($p < .001$) of valence of work with town size, and -.33 ($p < .001$) with skill level of the subject's father or guardian. This means that the urban workers from skilled backgrounds like work less than rural workers and those of unskilled backgrounds. As Table 2 shows, these more skilled urbanites tend to be white.

The evaluative ratings of job-seeking outcomes also support this contention. In general, blacks rate the direct outcomes of job-seeking behaviors as more pleasant (or less unpleasant) than do whites. An exception to this are three outcomes of "hanging around with friends,"

"sleeping late," "going places with friends," and "playing games (cards, etc.) with friends." "Wasting time," an outcome of "reading want ads," is also an exception. For these outcomes, either the whites as a group or the white working class are higher in evaluation than the blacks. This suggests that the blacks do not mind the job-seeking process as much as whites, and that whites, especially the working class, prefer leisure activities to job-seeking behavior. The whites also show a higher expectancy than the blacks for these outcomes, but this is not reflected in a corresponding higher evaluation of the behavior itself, nor in a greater frequency of intended performance. This may be due to the fact that whites report a stronger norm against "hanging around with friends" (norm direction: race effect $F = 10.13$, $p < .0001$; univariate F's: self = 15.00, $p < .0002$; friends = 5.16, $p < .03$; family = 38.79, $p < .0001$; other people = 4.07, $p < .05$) with the white working-class' responses the most strongly negative (though not significantly so). Whites also report more pressure on the part of family, friends, people in general, and self to not "hang around with friends" (family, $F = 4.55$, $p < .04$; friends, $F = 33.24$, $p < .0001$; people, $F = 6.04$, $p < .02$; self, $F = 28.90$, $p < .0001$; overall multivariate $F = 9.86$, $p < .0001$), and this adds to the effect, as shown by the significant (.31, $p < .05$) correlation between own norm strength and intended behavior in the white working-class sample. Thus, it seems that the white subjects, especially the working class, may seek work because they believe it is the only way to get by at all and because they believe the good opinion of important others depends on it; they may not like it much, but they have no other choice. The black samples, on the other hand, like work more but believe they can get along when

unemployed. If true, this leads to the prediction that blacks are less "locked into" jobs than whites, and that their satisfaction will be more closely related to turnover than will whites', other things equal. It also suggests the possibility that blacks who quit will have higher job satisfaction scores than whites who quit.

The arguments above are reminiscent of the conclusions of Lipset and Bendix (1963) who reported that upwardly mobile persons tend to adopt the political behavior of the middle classes (i.e., become more conservative). If this phenomenon is generalized to include work values and attitudes, and if it is conceded that the working-class blacks in this sample are upwardly mobile in terms of status and job opportunities, it may be speculated that the blacks are adopting the values usually ascribed to the white working class, while the whites themselves are becoming disillusioned.

The hypothesis that black subjects' evaluative responses, behavioral intentions, and reported behaviors would be less predictable than the whites' was not supported. This prediction was based on the assumptions that the blacks believe their environment to be unresponsive to their efforts, and that this unresponsiveness leads to a lack of relationship between behavior and estimates of reward probability x value (or valence) of rewards, and between estimated and directly measured value of work itself. The highest single correlation between estimated and directly measured valence of work was found in the black working-class sample, though this may be contaminated by method variance.

The black hardcore's evaluative responses are the most consistently predictable (on the basis of elicited outcomes); the white working class' responses are not as consistent, though one moderate correlation

in the proper direction is present. The multiple correlations show the black working class and white hardcore to be the most predictable (on Faces scale responses); responses on the SD scale are predictable for all but the black working class, but on the basis of correlations indicating a relationship opposite to the logical one.

The black working class and white hardcore are likewise the most predictable samples for behavioral intentions and reported behavior, though the latter is generally less predictable than the former. The specific behaviors also produce their own differences in predictability by sample. The black working-class' intentions to and reports of trying to join a training program and reading want ads are predictable; the white hardcore's intentions to go to an employment agency, fill out many applications, read want ads, and hang around with friends are predictable, but not their reported performance of these behaviors.

These results may be reconciled with the theory, though not without some saving assumptions. Tables 7-11 show that the white working class rates the probability of finding a job by each of five methods low in comparison to other samples, while the black hardcore is generally high. It may be that the whites in seeking more skilled, better-paying jobs, have more trouble finding work than the black hardcore, who can get daywork if nothing else is available. Thus, the white working class may perceive the job-seeking environment as unresponsive (especially in times of high unemployment) while for the black hardcore it may be no worse than it has ever been. In fact, it may be better since the advent of minority-group training programs and special hiring policies. In either case, job-seeking behavioral intentions and behaviors might be more a function of habit and convenience than the rational choice

process implied by the instrumentality model. Of course, this explanation goes far beyond the data, and must be subject to empirical verification.

The differential predictability of the various behaviors might well be due to cultural factors -- the white hardcore may not define training program participation as a viable alternative, while the black working class may see training as a channel for upward mobility. Employment agencies and "factory gate" applications may be seen as not useful because of the possibility of discrimination; however, want ad reading seems open to this possibility as well.

The prediction of the valence of work can not be explained by this logic, due to the unexpected predictability of the black hardcore sample. It may well be that the degree of responsiveness of the job-seeking environment is unrelated to the responsiveness of the job environment, and it is the latter which determines whether or not the valence of work itself can be predicted. Of course, problems of scale unreliability and other methodological considerations could also work to produce a confusing pattern of correlations.

However, it is interesting to note that the blacks perceived a higher instrumentality of work for the attainment of positive outcomes than did whites, which suggests that blacks see the work environment as more responsive than the whites. Also, as Tables 20 and 21 show, the estimated evaluation of work predicts behavioral intentions and reports only in the black-working class samples, while general and specific normative terms predict these variables (with one exception) only in the white samples, mostly the white hardcore. The exception is the black working-class' intention to join a training program. This suggests

again that the blacks are seeking the positive outcomes of work, while the whites are avoiding the negative consequences of unemployment.

Interestingly enough, the correlational analyses of job-history variables seem to indicate that the same process is occurring between the hardcore and working-class samples. In the hardcore sample (black and white combined), those who report obtaining money from non-work and non-public aid sources evaluate work lower and intend to seek it less often than those who do not. These relationships are not significant in the working-class samples. Skill level is also correlated negatively with evaluation and intended frequency of seeking work. Thus, the black hardcore subjects seem to be responding to the tangible rewards of work rather than to normative pressures to seek it. If these rewards can be obtained elsewhere, the tendence to seek work is reduced. However, since the correlations are low, the relationship needs further investigation before definite statements may be made.

Instrumentality Theory

The purely theoretical predictions of this study appear to have fared little better than the group difference predictions. Sample differences and method variance have combined to reduce the generality of instrumentality theory. Some consistent predictions, especially in the white hardcore sample, were obtained for the valence of work, indicating that the theory can work in this domain, but the general lack of predictability indicates that some modification is necessary.

The first necessary modification is in the list of outcomes used. Although the list of job outcomes used here was constructed to be relevant to all samples, this may not have succeeded. A list of salient outcomes must be constructed for each group; the $\Sigma (A_i I_i)$ term would

then be unique for each definable subgroup. This would, of course, prevent the comparison of job-outcome evaluations across groups.

The second modification centers about measurement techniques. As Table 22 shows, correlations are generally higher when "Faces" measures are used as the criterion, implying that method variance may inflate the obtained correlations. Though this is not obviously the case in Tables 16 and 19, care should still be taken to remove such extraneous variance in future studies, especially in field settings. Though this inflation does not influence the results of studies which compare different theoretical models (Anderson and Fishbein, 1967), it may give a distorted view of the predictive power of the theory.

The model does work well in the prediction of the valence of each job-seeking behavior, even taking method variance into account. This suggests that the fault is in the $\Sigma (A_i I_i)$ term, rather than in the model itself. Even so, sample and behavior differences in predictability emerge.

These differences may be due to differential familiarity with the behavior or the job-finding channel (employment agencies, training programs, etc.) or with the nature of the behavior itself. That is, "reading want ads" evaluation might be due to what particular ads are present on a given day; "hanging around with friends" might be good or bad, depending on which friends are available and what there is to do. On the other hand, employment agency and "applications" procedures might be so standardized that a generalized evaluation can be reliably made and predicted. And, of course, the more familiar a particular group is with these behaviors, the more likely it is that a generalized evaluation can be made (if it is possible at all).

The use of certainty weights does not improve the obtained correlations, directly contradicting the hypothesis. Thus, uncertainty either does not operate to reduce the correlation, or the certainty measure used is inadequate. If the former, then Graen's (1969) concept of "boundary conditions" is called into question; this hypothesis states that the environment must be responsive and predictable before the theory holds.

Incidentally, these results bear on Brigham's (1971) proposal that the use of certainty weights can improve the prediction of behavior from stereotypes. If the point is granted that the relationships between beliefs about an object, evaluations of the beliefs, and evaluation of the object are constant across content areas, these results would tend to disconfirm his hypothesis.

If the certainty measure is assumed to be inadequate, then the obtained differences in predictability can be explained in another way. We can hypothesize that the job-seeking environments are differentially responsive to persons of different races and social-class and that this differential responsiveness leads to the obtained correlations. This is an extension of the previous argument concerning behavioral prediction -- that different groups of people can behave alike for different reasons. Neither working-class samples' rating of the valence of want ads is predictable, but the white working class is the only group whose responses to "training" are unpredictable. It may be that both the working-class groups feel they cannot influence the situation when answering want ads, but only the white working-class group feels that training programs are unpredictable situations. This is understandable, since these programs are aimed primarily at the poor and/or minority groups. Whether this

explanation or the previous one is more valid must be tested empirically.

The normative component of the instrumentality equation did not generally add much to the prediction of behavioral intentions or reports, as Table 21 shows. However, it is interesting to note than when significant regression weights were obtained, six out of seven were in the white sample, suggesting that normative pressure is perhaps a greater influence in the white than the black environment. This is highly speculative, since so few terms were significant. Also, these results imply that normative influences are greater on the white hardcore than the working class, a result which contradicts the earlier argument that the white working class may be responding to normative pressure and perceived negative consequences of unemployment.

The fact that the expectancy $\Sigma(A_k E_k)$ term never has a significant beta weight in the prediction of reported or intended behavior, and the $\Sigma (A_i I_i)$ term does, stands in direct contradiction to Fishbein's (1967) model, which states clearly that behavioral intentions are an additive function of the attitude toward the act and normative pressure. In this case, attitude toward the object predicts specific behavioral intentions better than attitude toward the act itself.

This may be due to the special class of behaviors examined in this paper. Each of the behaviors is a means as well as an end, unlike those typically used in attitude/behavior research. Since work is, for most people, a highly important part of life, and being unemployed is inconvenient at best and a personal disaster at worst, job-seeking behavior ought to be more a function of attitude toward work than attitude toward the specific behaviors. If black subjects are, in fact, motivated by the positive outcomes of work, it ought to be especially true for them

and in fact is.

The reasoning can be simply stated: Temporary unpleasantness can be endured if it leads, even with only a small probability, to a very desirable outcome. This may be why the perceived probability of finding a job by each behavior did not add any significant degree of predictability to the equations (Table 24).

General Discussion

It appears that instrumentality theory must be further modified if it is to deal successfully with the prediction of behavior (via behavioral intentions) and attitude. While the basic model seems adequate, especially in light of past research, further work is needed to determine the conditions under which attitude toward the object becomes an important determinant of intention. Also, more research is necessary to determine the extent and nature of the boundary conditions -- especially with reference to the interface between perceived and actual lack of a responsive work environment. Obviously, the black and white samples in this study did not behave as expected, due perhaps to the whites' (hypothetical) alienation from work and the blacks' unexpected perception of strong contingencies between behavior and reward. The next study should attempt to measure perceived locus of control directly, with a measure specific to the situation, rather than inferring an internal or external orientation on the basis of earlier research in different populations. The question of whether alienation produced by two different situations actually exists, and if so, what effect it has on responses to job and job-seeking situations, should also be investigated.

Few firm policy recommendations can be made on the basis of these

data. In terms of job-seeking channels, employment agencies seem underused in comparison with factory-gate applications and reading want ads. Training programs seem especially underused by whites. Employment agencies could benefit by some restructuring to eliminate some of their more objectionable features (see Table 6). Training programs might be made more readily available to working-class persons, and all training programs might be made more relevant by tying the training to the jobs in shortest supply. In this way, the perceived probability of obtaining a job may increase.

The possible alienation of the working-class white is a social problem of greater magnitude than can be covered in this report. The disenchantment of the working class has been commented on before, in many contexts. The solution must be found in national social and economic policy, which hopefully will benefit minority groups as well.

This generally is the basis for any possible change in the job-seeking environment. If people are to feel that their efforts are rewarded, and that they can obtain their goals through work, the work situation must be made responsive. Possibly changes in compensations systems could be engineered, so that a given amount of pay could be taken as extra time off, retirement benefit, investment, etc., as the individual prefers. But before such changes can have the desired effect, everyone who wants a job must be able to find one. He (or she) must also have the skills, or be able to obtain the skills, which allow progress in the economic system. If the goal is to maximize the satisfaction of workers while maintaining production, and to incorporate as many minority group members as possible into the system, then the system itself must be one which allows the person to gain what he, personally, values, through his own efforts.

References

Anderson, L. R., & Fishbein, M. Prediction of attitude from the number, strength, and evaluative aspect of beliefs about the attitude object, In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Battle, E. S., & Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of social control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.

Blood, M. R. Relationships among worker's backgrounds, attitudes, behaviors and value systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968.

Blood, M. R., & Hulin, C. L. Alienation, environmental characteristics and worker responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 284-290.

Bloom, R., & Barry, J. R. Determinants of work attitudes among Negroes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 291-294.

Bradford, D. L. Formation of achievement attitudes among lower-class Negro youth. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, (1-A), 292-293.

Bullough, B. Alienation in the ghetto. American Journal of Sociology, 1967, 72, 469-478.

Champagne, J. E., & King, D. C. Job-satisfaction factors among underpriveleged workers. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 429-434.

Chemers, M. Cross-cultural training as a means of improving situational favorableness. Technical Report No. 61, Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1968.

Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys, the culture of the gang. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.

Cohen, J. Multiple regression as a general data-analytic system. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 426-444

Dean, D. G. Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 753-758.

Dreger, R., & Miller, K. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. Psychological Bulletin Monograph, 1968, 70, Part 2.

Dulany, D. E. Hypotheses and habits in verbal "operant conditioning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 251-263.

Feldman, J. M. Race, Economic Class, and Job-Seeking Behavior: An Exploratory Study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972.

Fiedler, F. E., & Mitchell, T. The effect of culture training on task group effectiveness. Mimeo, 1968.

Fishbein, M. Chapters 44 and 47 in M. Fishbein (Ed.), Attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Fishman, J. A. Bilingual attitudes and behaviors. Language Sciences, 1969, 5, 5-11.

Forward, J. R., & Williams, J. R. Internal-external control and black militancy. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26 (1).

Galbraith, J., & Cummings, L. L. An empirical investigation of the motivational determinants of task performance: Interactive effects between instrumentality-valence and motivation-ability. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1967, 2, 237-257.

Gore, P. M., & Rotter, J. B. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 58-64.

Graen, G. Instrumentality models of role behavior. Urbana, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1968a. (Mimeo)

Graen, G. An experimental test of the instrumentality models. Urbana, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1968b. (Mimeo)

Graen, G. Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 1969, 53, Part 2.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Bettie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 29-54.

Hackman, J. R., & Anderson, L. R. The strength, relevance and source of beliefs about an object in Fishbein's attitude theory. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 76, 55-67.

Hackman, J. R., & Porter, L. W. Expectancy theory predictions of work effectiveness. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 417-426.

Harris, D. R., Bisbee, C. T., & Evans, S. H. Further comments -- misuse of analysis of convariance. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 75, 220-223.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Hilgard, E. R. Theories of learning. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. The motivation to work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Hulin, C. L., & Blood, M. R. Job enlargement, individual differences, and worker responses. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 41-55.

Jones, M. B. Correlation as a dependent variable. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 69-72.

Kaplan, K. J. A methodological comparison of two techniques of attitude measurement. Unpublished Masters thesis. University of Illinois, 1966.

Katzell, R. A., Ewen, R. B., & Korman, A. K. The job attitudes of workers from different ethnic backgrounds. Research Report, Department of Labor, No. 41-8-006-34, New York University, New York, 1970.

Kunin, T. The development of a new type of attitude measure. Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8, 65-78.

Lawler, E. E. A correlational-causal analysis of the relationship between expectancy attitudes and job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 462-469.

Lawler, E. E. Job attitudes and employee motivation: Theory, research and practice. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 223-237.

Lawler, E. E., & Porter, L. W. Antecedent attitudes of effective managerial performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1967, 2, 122-143.

Lefcourt, H. M., & Ladwig, G. W. The American Negro: A problem in expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1965, 1, 377-380. (a)

Lefcourt, H. M., & Ladwig, G. W. Effect of reference group upon Negroes' task persistence in a biracial competitive game. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 668-671. (b)

Lefton, M. Race, expectations and anomia. Social Forces, 1968, 46, 347-352.

Liebow, E. Behavior and values of streetcorner Negro men. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, (3-B), 775.

Lipset, S. M., & Bendix R. Social mobility in industrial society. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

Montagu, M. F. A. A handbook of anthropometry. Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1960.

O'Brien, G. E., Fiedler, F. E., & Hewett, T. Effects of programmed culture training upon the performance of volunteer medical teams in Central America. Technical Report No. 76, Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1969.

Peak, H. Attitude and motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, 1968.

Roach, J. L., & Gurssilin, O. R. An evaluation of the concept "culture of poverty." Social Forces, 1967, 45, 383-392.

Rosenberg, M. J. Cognitive structure and attitudinal affect. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 367-372.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 22, 185-218.

Sheppard, H. L., & Belitsky, A. H. The job hunt. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Smith, P. C. The development of a method of measuring job satisfaction: The Cornell studies. In E. A. Fleishman (Ed.), Studies in personnel and industrial psychology. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1969.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. New York: Rand McNally, 1969.

Sommer, L. (trans.) Exposition of a new theory on the measurement of risk by Daniel Bernoulli. Econometrika, 1954, 22, 23-36.

Strickland, B. R. Prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 66, 353-358.

Symonds, J. Culture differences and social class in the Negro community. Report No. 1, SRS No. RD-2841-G. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1969.

Taber, T. Satisfaction and motivation as functions of the level of expectation and the valence of outcomes. University of Illinois, 1970. (Mimeo)

Tolman, E. C. Purposive behavior in animals and men. New York: Century, 1932.

Tolman, E. C. Principles of purposive behavior. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 2. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, 92-157.

Triandis, H. C. Person perception: A review of the literature and implications. Report No. 3, SRS No. 15-P-55175/5. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Person perception among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 5, SRS No. 15-P-55175/5. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Role perceptions among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 6, SRS No. 15-P-55175/5. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1971. (a)

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Job perceptions among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 7, SRS No. 15-P-55175/5. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1971. (b)

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. The perception of implicative relationships among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 8, SRS No. 15-P-55175/5. Champaign, Illinois: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1971. (c)

Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, R. S. Studies of black and white interactions in job settings. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1971, 1, 101-117.

Triandis, H. C., McGuire, H., Saral, T., Yang, K., Loh, W., & Vassiliou, V. A cross-cultural study of role perceptions. Technical Report No. 67, Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1968.

Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. A comparative analysis of subjective culture. Technical Report No. 55, Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1967.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., & Nassiakou, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph, 1968, 8, Part 2.

Vroom, V. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Wellman, D. The wrong way to find jobs for Negroes. Trans-Action, 1968, (April), 9-18.

Zalinger, A. D. Job training programs: Motivational and structural dimensions. In R. J. Margolin and G. J. Goldin (Eds.), Special Report: Research Utilization Conference on Rehabilitation in Poverty Settings. Boston: New England Rehabilitation Research Institute, Northeastern University, 1969.